The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIII, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1950

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Bishop McCormick . . . opposite page 241

Ad Multos Annos! 241

Mary's Last Home . . . . . *Robert North, S.J.* 242

St. Gregory the Great: Salary and Spirituality in the Priesthood . . . . . *Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R.* 262

The Recent Marian Congress at Le Puy-en-Velay *Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M.* 273

Genesis I-XI and Prehistory. Part III *Edward P. Arbez, S.S.* 284

The Church and God's Promises . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 295

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

When the Common Preface is a Proper One 309

The Sequence of the Biretta and Genuflection 309

The Multiplication of Octaves 310

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

The Assistant Priest at Solemn Mass 310

Patriarchs and Prophets in the Liturgy 311

Dispensation from the Banns of Marriage 311

Non-Catholic Students in a Catholic College 312

Catholics at Easter Sunrise Service 313

BOOK REVIEWS

The History of the Chaplain Corps, U. S. Navy, *by Clifford Merrill Drury* 315

Where I Found Christ, *edited by John A. O'Brien* . . 317

Whither Goest Thou? *by E. K. Lynch, O.Carm.* . . . 319

BOOK NOTES 320

REALITY

A Synthesis of Thomistic Thought

by R. GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P.

Translated by

PATRICK CUMMINS, O.S.B.

$6.00

THE eminent Dominican theologian, author of the present volume, after a lifetime devoted to the study of St. Thomas and his commentators, crowns his labors in this work. He here sets forth in systematic and integrated order the chief doctrines of Thomistic thought. A thorough familiarity, not only with the *Summa Theologica* and the numerous other writings of Aquinas, but also with the galaxy of commentators qualifies Father Garrigou-Lagrange to present in a single volume a comprehensive summary of Thomistic teaching.

Reality is thus a 400-page summary of Thomistic doctrine arrayed in coherent sequence and orderly arrangement. Since the Holy See has repeatedly declared the value of Thomistic philosophy and theology, Catholic students and scholars will heartily welcome this one-volume synthesis.

At your bookstore or from

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 & 17 So. Broadway St. Louis 2, Mo.

AD MULTOS ANNOS!

The Editorial Board of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* offers its heartfelt congratulations to His Excellency, the Most Reverend Patrick Joseph McCormick, D.D., Ph.D., Bishop of Atenia, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, and Rector Magnificus of The Catholic University of America on the occasion of his episcopal consecration.

MARY'S LAST HOME

Strictly Scriptural proofs of the Assumption are so controverted that the exegete can scarcely do more than look hopefully to the Holy See to clarify in due time their probative force.[1] Meanwhile to the biblical geographer falls the congenial task of determining and "evoking" the site of that revered event. Though the discussion turns out to be not without doctrinal significance, its interest is chiefly with the human details of the story, to give not merely "a local habitation and a name" but also furnishings, scenery, and neighbors to the reasoned theorems of the textbooks.

In the definitive Dominican opus on the authenticity of the Holy Places of Jerusalem, Père Abel begins his treatment of the "Tomb of the Virgin" by asserting that from the earliest records a *double* tradition already divides the field between Jerusalem and Ephesus. Thence arises a problem, to be examined in its objective elements, without prejudice in favor of either view. Loyal to this declaration, he reviews the evidence with an admirable impartiality, and awards his judicious verdict to the Holy City.[2]

[1] The text chiefly in question is the Protoevangelium, *Gen.* 3:15. If this is interpreted to concern our Lady either literally (inclusive or exclusive of Eve) or typically, it must be further shown to contain *formaliter implicite*, without the intervention of any extra-biblical premise, her exemption from (continued) death: so J. M. Bover, *La Asunción de María* (Madrid, 1947), pp. 4-30; Gabriel M. Roschini, *Compendium Mariologiae* (Rome, 1946), p. 461; Luigi G. Da Fonseca, "L'Assunzione di Maria nella Sacra Scrittura," *Biblica*, XXVIII (1947), 353. So also Tiburtius Gallus, "Assumptio ex Protevangelio Definibilis," *Divus Thomas*, LII (1949), 121-41, holding with Martin Jugie, *La Mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge* (Vatican, 1944), p. 569, that Mary *never died*. Others interpret *Gen.* 3:15 tenaciously of Mary, but not of the Assumption: so Santiago Alameda, *La Virgen en la Biblia y en la primitiva iglesia* (Barcelona, 1939), p. 405; others find the Assumption at least typically in the Scriptures, but not in the Protoevangelium, so Paul Renaudin, *La doctrine de l'Assomption, sa définibilité* (Paris, 1912), p. 142.—Finally some weighty recent studies deny that *Gen.* 3:15 can be held to refer to our Lady even in the legitimate *typical* sense: so F. Ceuppens, *De Mariologia Biblica* (Rome, 1949), pp. 19-23, following Drewniak, Lennerz, Heinisch, and Merkelbach.

[2] Hugues Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem: recherches de topographie, d'archéologie, et d'histoire*, II (Paris, 1926), 805-31.

FITNESS OF JERUSALEM'S CLAIM

Agreement with this verdict is virtually unanimous among scholars of our day. The dormition of our Lady is honored at the magnificent German Benedictine church beside the Cenacle; and an ancient Orthodox basilica in the Valley of Josaphat is the shrine of her empty tomb.

It is *fitting* that this should be so. One who has had the privilege of being in Jerusalem for the Feast of the Assumption would scarcely give thought to another site. Reason itself seems to demand that the last souvenirs of our Lady be linked with those of her Son and of the nascent Church.

The giant Dormition monument mirrors the insistence of Christian piety that the Mother of Jesus lived out her days near the upper room where the Church took form. Here was the first Mass; here she was in prayer among the Apostles when the Holy Spirit descended; why should she ever have gone away? where else should the church of her passing have been erected?

In its position at the topmost level of Sion hill,[3] the massive rotunda and detached spire of the Dormition are the most conspicuous central landmark of the city. Thus it was inevitably a prime target of the Jewish-Arab conflict of 1948. It lay exposed in the line of fire between the two hostile slopes; and its possession was seen to be a vitally strategic advantage. How a handful of Israeli troops managed to wrest this prize from the solid block of Arab defenders and thereby gain their sole precarious footing in the Old City, is a mystery unexplained by records of the fighting. That the betrayal of Mary's shrine to pillage and isolation was due to the intervention of Christian jealousies is a possibility not pleasant to contemplate.[4]

[3] The Biblical Sion was the fortified hill of the Jebusites, converted by David into the first Hebrew settlement of Jerusalem. A Christian tradition, dominant until recent days, located this site at the highest (south*west*) ridge of the Old City, to the south of the present wall. This tradition is tenaciously maintained by both Jews and Moslems, who honor (our) Cenacle as the Tomb of David. Christian archaeologists have meanwhile abandoned this localization, and place the historic Sion on the lower south*east* slope, below and to the south of the Temple area. But [pseudo-] "Sion" must be recognized as the modern name of the western hill.

[4] The paramount British influence in Arab Legion operations is brought out in an absorbing article by E. Pellegrino, "Lo Stato d'Israele" in *Gentes: Rivista Missionaria*, XXIII (1949), 201-26. But it is not the British alone

The wounds inflicted on the Dormition are keenly painful to a Catholic. Yet in sober fact they are mild in comparison with the wholesale ravishment of almost any church in urban Germany, and to this extent our Lady's influence has protected her shrine and its custodians from their nation's fate. In the Dormition crypt, serenly beautiful, lies the exquisite statue of "the hour of her death," restored from dishonor, though the precious ivory hands have not been replaced.

Before this statue, on the morning of July 30, 1949, stood a group of attentive American Jewish tourists. Silence and ceremonial devoutness were exacted of them more rigorously than even in the Jewish sanctuary nearby. The Israeli guide recited respectfully the essentials of our Marian tradition. Its simple genuineness, and the innate charm of the chosen Jewish maiden, evoked a consoling natural reverence. The government tourist-agency may have been motivated by propaganda, but it is significant that they have realized how sensitive the world's Catholics are to this respect due to their Mother.

The basilica is still unattended, because the Benedictines found unacceptable the condition that Israeli troops occupy the tower. The Jews value this eyrie not so much for its strategic importance as because here is the only spot in their whole state from which they can look into the City of David, the Temple area, the Wailing Wall, and the tombs of their heroes in the Valley of Josaphat. Glares of defiance pass between the boyish sentries here and on the Arab wall a few feet across. Today the Dormition, dominatingly conspicuous from both sides of the barbed-wire frontier, looms before the sundered Christian communities as a symbol: of fear and indignation, but also of union and hope, *faciens utraque unum*.

From Sion hill diagonally across the Temple esplanade, deep at the roots of Olivet is the fortress-church commemorating the Virgin's Tomb. Its strong austere portal harmonizes with the funereal calm of the grave-strewn Josaphat hillside.[5] Inside, the clammy

---

whose intrigues for sanctuaried intrenchment are notorious in Palestine. The Dormition property was originally acquired by the German government to make it plain that German Catholics "were not in need of a French protective domination in the Orient," Theodor Zahn, "Die Dormitio sanctae Virginis und das Haus des Johannes-Markus," *Neue kirkliche Zeitschrift*, X (1899), 377.

[5] Vincent [-Abel] *Jérusalem*, II, 825.

underground vault is brightened only by the gay notes of the Orthodox chant. Greeks are everywhere conspicuous for the naïve tokens of their awareness of Mary's motherhood in simple everyday actions. From their homes above Calvary they stream down the steep hill to honor the shrine, especially around their feast of the Assumption.

The church is of course open to worshipers of every rite; indeed, it is difficult to refuse the invitation to take an honored part in their liturgy. But the Latin Catholics have at their disposal a Franciscan grotto whose altar is contiguous to the wall of the Virgin's Tomb, where the pilgrim feels as close to the authentic spot as any tradition could guarantee, for the *Gaudeamus omnes in Domino* of the festive Assumption Mass.

The memories crowded into the mile of crooked archways between here and the Dormition are rich and tender. In a sense, for the evocation of the solitary figure of our Lady after the departure of her Son, the cobblestones of Jerusalem are strangely silent. Everywhere they speak of Mary only with and in the shadow of Jesus. In the Josaphat setting there is indeed an Old-Testament nostalgia suggesting the poignance of being left apart from Christ. The Sion monument, on the other hand, appears from the dawn of its tradition as a museum, concentrating all sorts of biblical souvenirs under one roof for the convenience of pilgrims.[6] Apart from the haunting events of the evening of Holy Thursday which cling here by right of ownership, many disparate episodes were venerated here either by a sort of nucleation or for the presence of an alleged relic. With all its fascination, densely-monumented Jerusalem is at a disadvantage for bringing to life the primitive genuinity of the Gospel background. Amid such exuberance, the figure of our Lady in solitude quite fades from the grasp of the imagination.

Yet this fanciful demand seems petulant when once the question is formulated, "But where *else* could she possibly have been?" The sense of fitness does not attach merely to the natural exigency that the Mother be with the Son. Even if there were no tradition linking the Assumption of Mary with Jerusalem, the immemorial holiness of the place avails to designate it as the obvious setting for such an event. This sacredness of Jerusalem is to the pilgrim a tangible thing, far more overwhelming than what he may have

[6] M.-J. Lagrange in a review of Zahn's "Dormitio" in *Revue biblique*, VIII (1899), 597.

imagined from his studies or meditation. If ever the *argumentum convenientiae* could be justly applied, it would justify localizing here the tomb of our Lady.

SOME HUMAN FACTORS IN TOPOGRAPHY

And yet, this very fitness gives pause. Daily experience proves that Jerusalem is a garden in whose fertile soil a pious plausibility can quickly take root and grow into a "tradition."

Obliging fellahs have an uncanny skill in divining from the way the question is asked, what answer will enable the inquirer to dovetail a local term with proto-semitic cognates into a prestigious toponomic proof. If this be true even in our scientific era, one can imagine the sixth-century situation from which stem our first pilgrim witnesses to the Jerusalem dormition.

The Holy City today shelters a corps of eminent scholars of every allegiance, some permanent, some constantly arriving from the world's centers of learning. They can quickly and authoritatively reject imposture, but give a fair hearing and global publicity to any proposal that squares with the proved facts. In addition to the interest and the facilities for that sort of thing, they have often at their disposal alert disciples questing for an unplowed field in which to plant and nurture their thesis. This dynamo of on-the-spot scientific energy, preserved by Christian charity from feuds and partisan excesses, constitutes a glory of our scholarship. But one cannot help reckoning with the possibility that if it were lifted up and transplanted bodily to some remote spot in Turkey, wonderful discoveries there would presently electrify the scientific world.

Fifty years ago no one seriously questioned the location of the House of Caiphas on "Sion" hilltop beside the Cenacle. Then came the event indignantly entitled, "How New Sanctuaries Spring Up in Palestine": The Assumptionist Fathers of Notre-Dame de France, in their excellent guide-book, had dared to locate the Trial of Jesus at their property on Sion slope. Attack and repulse flared vigorously, with every biblical institute of Palestine wielding an expert lance.[7] The "new" site, called Saint Peter at Cockcrow, now

[7] The traditional hilltop site is defended by Urban Coppens, *Wie in Palästina neue Heiligtümer entstehen* (Jerusalem, 1905) and Hugues Vincent, *Revue biblique* XIV (1905), 149-58; *Jérusalem*, II, 482-515. The Assumptionist site is upheld by Xavier Marchet, *Le véritable emplacement du Palais de Caïphe* (Paris, 1927) and Edmond Power, *Biblica*, IX (1928), 167-86.

stands isolated in an Arab military zone. A group of eminent French scholars was admitted there for a visit last Aug. 15, their guide a razor-sharp Assumptionist Brother. Though he summarized the issues of the controversy with loyal fervor, many thoughtful listeners looked as if they would feel more secure ranged behind the armor of Père Vincent. Then the guide smoothly played his trump card. "Anyway, the hilltop tradition is just a footnote now, because the structure was shattered by bombardment, and its remains are in an area which cannot be reached by either students or pilgrims!"[8]

It is no discredit to our research that it is conditioned, negatively, by purely material and political factors. The respective investigators, who command esteem no less by their unstinting sharing of their sources of information than by their war-straitened hospitality, would be the first to admit that their interest in other perhaps worthier sites has been balked by inaccessibility. This fact has a bearing on *any* topographical dispute. Truth asks only for a hearing. In obscure and complicated problems, many scraps of evidence on both sides contribute toward a pondered and fallible decision. These scraps will be found only where they are looked for. They will be looked for only by those who are present to them in space and in sympathy. The assessor must determine not merely which side has the most scraps to its favor, but also to what extent this abundance may be ascribed to optimum working-conditions. In Jerusalem the conditions have been the best in the biblical world.

Making full allowance for extrinsic advantages, we must nevertheless acknowledge with Père Abel that the Jerusalem tradition is intrinsically superior.

Since Zahn, it has been generally admitted that Ephesus is excluded by simple chronology. The Apostles made their regular abode in Jerusalem at least until the death of James in 44, and in fact *Acts* 15:2 and *Gal.* 2:9 indicate that they were at least readily accessible there until Peter went away in 68. Thus John's emigration, the only assignable motive of our Lady's, could not have oc-

[8] How forcibly the *lex orandi legem statuit credendi* is illustrated also by Emmaus. Though the "Dominican Amwas" near Latrun is authenticated by proofs which (save for the distance-difficulty) are regarded by scholars as definitive, still at the "Franciscan Emmaus" (el-Qubeibe) the sanctuary with hospice and Privileged Votive Mass carries more weight in forming the conviction of the pilgrim than all the fine print in the guide-books.

curred before she was some sixty years old, more probably eighty.[9] Though we have no reliable reason to doubt that she lived so long or much longer, it is improbable that in her advanced age she would have left the Holy Places on a difficult voyage just to be more literally "in care" of John, whom she in any case could hardly have accompanied constantly.

But even granting that Peter and John migrated from Jerusalem in 42, the narrative of *Acts* seems incompatible with the presence of Mary beside John in Ephesus. How could Paul have come there to preach despite his principle (*Rom.* 15:20) of not intervening in the territory of another Apostle? and how could he have called the elders from Ephesus to Miletus (*Acts* 20:17) instead of going to reverence the mother of the Lord. Moreover the *Acta Ioannis* of Leucius Charinus, 150 A.D., say that John came to Ephesus when he was aged, and do not indicate that he was accompanied by any woman.[10]

The second weighty argument for Jerusalem is the *indirect* testimony of the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae*. Of course not the slightest credibility attaches to the primary material of this fantastic forgery, which was to tell the miraculous transfer of the Apostles from their diaspora to comfort our Lady in her last hour and witness her Assumption. But according to sound critical principles, even a purely fictional creation is to be presumed reliable for background details taken for granted as intimately known to its readers. It requires no small critical acumen to draw the line so as not to include in this category (a) the predominant role of John at the death of Mary; and (b) the dispersal of the Apostles before "the

[9] Zahn "Dormitio" *Neue kirkliche Zeitschrift*, X (1899), 424. The age of Mary at her death is given by most Latin manuscripts of the *Transitus* as some 42 years (two years after the Ascension); by the sahidic recension and Hippolytus of Thebes as some 52 years (twelve years after the Ascension; the Apostles leaving Jerusalem only then, after Mary's death); by the Byzantine tradition as 60 to 80 years, thus Epiphanius and Andrew of Crete. Abel, *Jérusalem*, II, 806.[1]

[10] Abel, *Jérusalem* II, 806, Zahn "Dormitio," p. 424; Carl Clemen "The Sojourn of the Apostle John at Ephesus," *American Journal of Theology*, IX (1905), 656: "For the lifetime of Paul it cannot be denied that somewhere and somehow mention of this Apostle John would have been made if he was in Ephesus."

second year after the Ascension."[11] In any case the Jerusalem setting is more prominent and more "verifiable" in popular belief than these other details.

The earliest attestation of pilgrims to the presence of Mary's tomb in Jerusalem is after 500 A.D.[12] Fonck in a soundly-documented research proves that the alleged references in earlier accounts are interpolations inspired by the *Breviarius,* though he concedes that subsequent unanimity is noteworthy.[13] In view of the notorious proneness of pilgrims to record in their notebooks the things they *wanted* to see,[14] this unanimity is less surprising than the *silence* of Eusebius, Jerome, and Leo. The first Fathers who pronounce on the Marian tomb tradition (Gregory of Tours [d. 594], Modestus [d. 614], Andrew of Crete [d. 720], John Damascene [d. 760]) "describe it in terms which leave no doubt that they were borrowed from the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae.*"[15]

Perhaps the strongest claim for continuity with first-century beliefs is the combination of the architectural history of the two

[11] This date is given only in the Latin "A" text in Constantine Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae . . . item Mariae Dormitio* (Leipzig, 1866), pp. 113-23. This edition gives also a Greek text (95-112) and a Latin variant "B" (124-36). The *Transitus Mariae* was long thought to be a work of Melito Sardensis, before 300 A.D. Migne *Patrologia Graeca,* V, 1231-40 prints a version, carefully labeled spurious.

[12] [*Theodosius de Situ Terrae Sanctae und der*] *Breviarius de Hierosolymis,* ed. J. Gildemeister (Bonn, 1882), p. 35: "et ibi [near the Temple] est basilica sanctae Mariae et ibi est sepulchrum eius."

[13] Leopold Fonck, "Bemerkungen zu den ältesten Nachrichten über das Mariengrab," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* XXII (1898), 491: Theodosius has only "ibi est vallis Josaphat; ibi dominum Judas tradidit; ibi est ecclesia dominae Mariae matris Domini." The interpolation of a single manuscript, "et ibi est sepulcrum eius" was received by Tobler in his (first) edition of *Itinera Hierosolymitana* but expunged by Molinier in his re-edition. Fonck, p. 495: allusions to the tomb in Antoninus are shown to be suspect. Fonck admits that the burial of Mary, though not her death, may have been at Jerusalem, "Das Grab der Gottesmutter," *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach,* LII (1897), 143-56.

[14] M. Lenain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*[3] I (Venice, 1732), 469. This article, "Notes sur la sainte Vierge," pp. 457-77, is the principal defense of the Ephesus tradition.

[15] J. Turmel, "Assomption," *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* I (1895), 1137. For Andrew of Crete see *MPG,* XCVII, 1053; John Damascene XCVI, 748; Modestus LXXXVI, 3277.

Jerusalem sites with the "Euthymian history" cited by John Damascene, according to which Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem in 421-56, sent to the Empress Pulcheria the loculus of Mary's tomb. The text does not record him as answering clearly, however, "we have traditionally honored her empty tomb"; instead he puts it vaguely, "of her death the Scripture says nothing, but we have a tradition that she was assumed"—a tradition which by its details is traceable to the *Transitus*.[16]

Negative and internal criteria are emphatically in favor of Jerusalem. There is no internal *obstacle* to our Lady's having remained there until her death. No contrary argument can be drawn from the *silence* of the New Testament, except at most by a reflection from the similar and more striking silence surrounding Ephesus. The notion of a Jerusalem dormition is prosaically matter-of-fact, making no claims on the credulous imagination, but corresponding exactly to what down-to-earth common sense would have expected. Indeed, one of the strongest arguments for the Jerusalem tradition is the indiscreet zeal with which partisans of Ephesus have strained the evidence and taxed the probabilities, so that Lagrange must call their thesis *toute artificielle,* though he concedes that similar strainings have not been wanting in the Jerusalem camp.[17]

This weight of *common-sense,* heavy as it is and bolstering all the other arugments, nevertheless remains in the order of *internal* criteria. What is wanted in determining the authenticity of a tradition is *a posteriori* historical proofs. Such proofs, in the case of

[16] The Euthymian history is accepted as authenticating the site of the Josaphat tomb by Vincent, *Jérusalem,* II, 829. For a thorough but partisan research into the obscure question see Johannes Niessen, *Panagia-Kapuli* (Dülmen, 1906), pp. 119-56. Paul-M. Séjourné, "Le lieu de la dormition de la très-sainte Vierge," *Revue biblique,* VIII (1899), 141, while denying the Ephesus tradition, sees no true authenticity in the cenacle site: its earliest tradition is from the seventh century, its internal reasons unconvincing.

[17] M.-J. Lagrange, "La Dormition de la Sainte Vierge et la maison de Jean-Marc," *Revue biblique,* VIII (1899), 589-600; severe review of Mommert's defense of *Die Dormitio, Revue biblique,* IX (1900), 323: "Une bonne cause ne doit jamais être défendue avec de mauvais arguments." Zahn "Dormitio," *Neue kirkliche Zeitschrift,* X (1899), 427 (against Fonck); Barnabé Meistermann, *Le Tombeau de la Sainte Vierge à Jérusalem* (Jerusalem, 1903) against (pseudo-) Gabriélovich.

Jerusalem, involve to more or less extent an uncertain chronology, an argument from silence, unreliable forgeries, and lacunae. Scientifically therefore its tradition leaves something to be desired.

JERUSALEM AND THE ASSUMPTION

Accordingly it is somewhat disquieting that recent eminent scholars attach the Christian belief in the Assumption to the absolute exclusion of the Ephesus claim by Jerusalem.[18] Such a view would seem to lead logically to that of an able patrologist expressed recently in opposition to the definability of the Assumption: "the witness of the alleged Fathers of the Church, judged historically, has just as much or as little worth as the *Transitus,* and that means none at all"—save as a theological prop for miracles assumed to be veracious.[19]

It would certainly seem more desirable to contend that the theological doctrine of the Assumption is wholly independent of details of place. Yet this apparently moderate claim must be advanced with caution. Suppose it were to be defined that our dogma of the Assumption did not depend on any human reasoning but on a revelation explicitly preserved in the Church from the days of the Apostles. Then it would become necessary to demonstrate that in the documents which embody that tradition, indications of place are secondary. This may not be easy. But it is not the only accretion that would have to be expunged.

However, even granting that it should be simultaneously established (1) that the Assumption is revealed (by definition) and (2) that the documents which preserve that revelation embody with equal validity the Jerusalem tradition: this *combination,* which does not at present exist, would constitute a new and cogent, even apodictic proof for Jerusalem. As such it would be accepted loyally, just like any newly discovered archaeological evidence.

[18] L. Heidet and L. Pirot, "Assomption," *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément* I (1928), 652: "La question d'Éphèse étant ainsi résolument écartée, la tradition de Jérusalem seule demeure et doit être examinée. Cette tradition est double: a) topographique . . . b) théologique ou doctrinale: elle atteste la résurrection de Marie et son assomption corporelle au ciel." [655] "Toutefois de l'authenticité du sépulcre [at Jerusalem] ne résulte pas nécessairement le fondement de la croyance [in the Assumption] et l'on peut se demander si celle-ci [Assumption] n'est pas une legende qui se serait attachée plus tard au tombeau" [as Tillemont claimed, to disprove the Assumption].

[19] Berthold Althaner in *Theologische Revue,* XLIV (1948), 139.

Meanwhile, taking the evidence merely as it stands today, sound method demands that the Ephesus claim be given an impartial hearing.

THE TRADITION OF EPHESUS

Epiphanius, around 380 A.D., in order to refute the heresy that Mary later lived carnally with Joseph, says that the Scripture, to exclude all suspicion of her carnal union, does not even mention her being with John in Asia Minor, though this omission has left us in perplexity as to whether she ever died or not. "He gives to understand that he has some information he could disclose on the subject. To begin with, he all but states categorically that Mary followed John to Ephesus."[20]

The Council of Ephesus, 431, in an official document to the clergy and people of Constantinople, contains the expression: "[Ephesus,] where the theologian John and the virgin Mother of God holy Mary." This does not make sense. Yet critical research establishes beyond doubt that the text has not been mutilated. Accordingly it is necessary to supply a form of the verb *to be*. Heidet-Pirot claim that this can only be in the *present* tense, and must imply either that the *bodies* of John and Mary are thought to be in Ephesus at the moment of writing, or that "John and Mary" is a familiar way of referring to the *church* dedicated in their honor.[21]

It is true that the name of the church at this point of the document would be appropriate; and that (against Tillemont) such

[20] Abel, *Jérusalem*, II, 805. Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses MPG*, XLII, 716: [Fears that "accepit eam discipulus in sua" will provide excuse for defense of *subintroductae*. Maintains that after John took Mary into his house, he no longer lived in his house.] "But if any suspect an error, let them search the traces of Scripture, and they will no doubt find neither the death of Mary, nor whether she has died; nor whether she has been buried, nor whether she has not been buried. Yet meanwhile John was journeying about Asia; and it nowhere says that he took along with him the holy Virgin; but the Scripture simply kept silence because of excess of wonderment, so as not to bring men's minds into confusion. I do not dare to say it." ["Sword will pierce" makes it seem she died; *Apoc.* 12:13 makes it seem she was immortal.] "The Scripture passed beyond men's minds, and left them hanging in the air, because of the worthy and most singular vessel, so that none might be in suspicion of carnal matters in her regard. So whether she has died, we do not know; and though she be buried, she was never in fleshy union, *absit*."

[21] Heidet-Pirot, *DBSupplément*, I, 645.

long names as "Holy Mary Mother of God ever Virgin in Trastevere" are of ordinary occurrence. Moreover, churches are referred to quite casually, so that "Rome, where John and Paul is" or "in the Forum, near the Forty Martyrs" is unequivocal. But "Ephesus, where John and Mary [is/are]" is *not* unequivocal. Moreover, there seems to be no grammatical argument against supplying the verb in a past or *gnomic aorist* sense: "where John and Mary *are known to have been.*"

The claim that the Ephesus Fathers *could not* have understood Mary's presence in a personal sense rests ultimately on an argument from silence: the renowned letter from Polycrates in the Easter controversy invokes solemnly such lesser dignitaries as the "three daughters of Philip" in favor of the local Ephesus tradition, but does not allude to the Mother of Jesus. This would certainly be a significant omission if Mary were party to the tradition. But it is not unthinkable that she had resolutely signified her unwillingness to have any voice in the administrative disputes of the nascent church, so that she might be in the fullest sense the mother of all and devote herself to pure contemplation, "the better part, which shall not be taken from her." Indeed, some such supposition is in any case necessary to account for the eloquence of her silence and Luke's amid the wrangles which enlivened the Apostles' early years in Jerusalem. Finally, the letter of Polycrates does not cite Paul or Timothy either; which means not that they were not teaching in Ephesus, but that they had taken no stand on the quartodeciman question.

"It must be admitted that all the erudite subtleties devised to distort the sense of the phrase cannot be supported against its natural meaning: the synodal letter claims to affirm the stay, the life, the death, and the burial of John and Mary at Ephesus."[22] It does not follow that the Fathers of the Council were correct in this conviction. Nor does it follow that they were basing themselves on an authentic tradition reaching back by person-to-person contacts to the days of John. Abel holds plausibly that they *reasoned* to their belief (Mary lived with John [*John* 19:26]; *atqui* John lived at Ephesus; *ergo*) as a reaction against the flowery and unscriptural legends of the apocryphal Jerusalem tradition. But it is

[22] *Polycratis Ephesiorum Episcopi Fragmenta ex Epistola ad Victorem*, *MPG*, V, 1357. Abel, *Jérusalem*, II, 808.

impossible to deny that "from 431 a considerable and precise authority, in appearance preferable to the whole apocryphal literature, attests the tradition of Ephesus."

The Church of Ephesus is known to have been named for our Lady, and is claimed to be the first church thus named in Christendom.[23] By analogy with a Carthage decree forbidding naming a church after a martyr except where he suffered or was interred, it is claimed that only a tradition of our Lady's death could have justified this title. It is true there was a church of Saint Stephen at Constantinople long before Jerusalem; and another dedicated to the Apostles there some thirty years before it held any of their relics. But it may at least be admitted that the Fathers of Ephesus named the church in view of their conviction that Mary (must have) died here.[24] Insupportable is the objection that no tomb of Mary has been found in the church of Ephesus. Such big convenient tangibles, which abound (often wondrously multiplied) in the reliquaries of Rome, are archaeological liabilities. In any case no tomb of John is pointed out either, though his stay and death in or near Ephesus is not questioned.

In 1881 it was observed by Abbé Jean Gouyet that a little house on the hill of Bulbul Dagh bore a noticeable resemblance to that described in the visions of Anne Catherine Emmerich as the one in which our Lady died near Ephesus. In 1891 a corps of investigators under the unsympathetic Lazarist professor at Smyrna, Henry Jung, verified the pertinent details, which were duly publicized by the then Archbishop of Smyrna and presently attracted a fever of scholarly interest. Some pushed the discovery with passionate piety, others rejected it with scorn.

The occasion was a useful one for clarifying issues on the validity of private revelations in scriptural research. Three principles of Christian theology emerge clearly. (1) *No* private revelation

[23] Hartmann Grisar holds that Rome's Sancta Maria Antiqua is the oldest church in the world dedicated to our Lady, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XX (1896), 113 (not page 196, as given in Heidet-Pirot).

[24] H. Leclercq, "Éphèse," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, V (1922), 135: "Les Ephésiens du IV^e^ siècle avaient quelque peu oublié la grande Diane, la déesse vierge; et il ne leur déplaisait pas d'accaparer le souvenir de Marie, la vierge mère de Dieu; ils associaient, sans autre embarras, le culte de Marie au culte de Jean, peut-être dans un même sanctuaire, peut-être dans l'église double."

has any scientific, exegetic, or dogmatic force; even positive approbation by the Church (which is something *additional*) implies at most that the content is not *contrary* to any Christian doctrine of faith or morals. (2) *Any* private conviction, whether it be revelation or mere imagination, if plausible may laudably serve as *point of departure* for a scientific investigation. (3) Private revelations insofar as conformable to proved facts may usefully serve for illustration and atmosphere. A certain instinctive reverence finds distasteful such undignified partisan wrangling as "Why prefer the Westphalian nun to Saint Bridget and all the other mystics? . . . [her account] is not an arsenal on which savants and critics ought to draw."[25] Any alleged private revelation, whether reliable or illusory, has a legitimate protreptic function, but should be left discreetly at the threshold in establishing historic or doctrinal fact.

On its own merits, then, the little house of Bulbul Dagh is of negligible importance to the Ephesus question. Its name, "Panaya Kapouli," "our Lady's door or house" is supposed to be of immemorial tradition, but like the processions which come here on the feast of the Assumption, cannot be proved free of etiological taint. Its ruins could be from as early as the first century; but that proves nothing; such ruins abound in the whole region, whereas the most indisputably authentic localizations of Palestine have seldom any structure dated beyond Constantine.[26] All in all the claims put forward for Kapouli have injured rather than helped the Ephesus tradition.[27] In justice the final authoritative word is that of Cabrol: the status remains exactly what it was before Bulbul

[25] Heidet-Pirot, *DBSupplément*, I, 648-49.

[26] Heidet-Pirot (p. 650) unreasonably claim, "What is called for is a Hebrew or Greek inscription, or at least signs on the walls or in the vicinity clearly and authentically attesting that these walls were erected for the Blessed Virgin and that they sheltered her."

[27] E. P. Gabriélovich, *Éphèse ou Jérusalem* (Paris, 1897), p. viii, points out how extremists have weakened the case for Jerusalem. F. Cabrol, "(Fête de l') Assomption," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, I, 2996: "Nous conclurons, avec les critiques sérieux, qu'il ne faut pas attacher d'importance à cette prétendue découverte, et que la question reste celle qu'elle était aux temps de Tillemont."—It should not be omitted from consideration that the only Pope to pronounce in the dispute was Benedict XIV, in a private capacity, in favor of (Tillemont and) Ephesus.

Dagh was mentioned, neither better nor worse. If and insofar as the Ephesus claim has probability, the localization of Panaya Kapouli has a certain illustrative aptness, but to allude to it by way of proof is inadvisable.

RÔLE OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF SMYRNA

Once dotted with flourishing bishoprics, the Christianity of Asia Minor has now so dwindled that even once-great Ephesus has become a part of the See of Izmir. The "angel of the church of Smyrna" is today Archbishop Giuseppe Descuffi, successor of Saint Polycarp. An Italian born in Istanbul, he was for thirty years professor there in the college and seminary of Saint-Benoît, and is now nearing completion of his difficult new Turkish version of the Scripture.

Like his predecessor of *Apoc.* 2:9, the Archbishop of Smyrna is rich in his poverty and tribulation. In a suspicious and unsympathetic milieu, his persevering scholarship and gracious cordiality shine out as in a chosen frame.

Of the Turkish regime, it must be said that it nowadays treats the plainest Americans with appreciative deference. If one's freedom of movement is irksomely restricted by a silken mesh of surveillance, it requires no insight to see that this is not unfriendliness but simply terror of Red infiltration. The ordinary Turks show a naïve helpfulness and religious respect which is in the most charming oriental tradition.

But far beneath this spontaneous graciousness there is a deep-smouldering resentment of the suspected politico-religious intrigues of foreigners, religion masking espionage in time of war, and commerce masking proselytism in time of peace. This hostility creates barriers of cruel futility to hamper Christian missionary efforts.

Archbishop Descuffi is conscious of the peculiar responsibilities which this milieu imposes on him as upholder of a rich apostolic tradition. Whereas at Jerusalem a sacred site can be unremittingly examined by the microscopes of scholarship, here excavations are rare and difficult. There, enthusiastic pilgrims observe and publicize uncounted shreds of detail, sometimes relevant; here, pilgrims are few and tethered. Thus the burden of sustaining from oblivion the Ephesus tradition falls upon his shoulders. He must see to it that ancient witnesses are conserved, new techniques applied, and undeserved opposition parried. Moreover there is the question of

fitting honor to be paid. Just as a host-particle cannot be casually flung aside if it be only slightly probable that it has been consecrated, so the Marian sacredness of Ephesus deserves a modest hyperdulia in proportion to its modest probability.

With old-world courtliness this amiable prelate welcomes the Christian visitor to Izmir. His sympathetic and spiritual-minded conversation is sure to gravitate toward the subject of our Lady's Assumption. With a modest reasonableness equaling that of Père Abel, he will point out that the Jerusalem claim is indeed more solidly founded and in many ways more acceptable. But oversimplifications are to be avoided; the claims of Ephesus have their own title to respect. What has been said fifteen centuries ago can never be unsaid; it can only be explained; and the ultimately adequate explanation has not up till now been found. The pilgrim is suavely brought to a realization that he will gain much from interpreting his visit to Ephesus in this Marian light, not as a fact, but as a possibility.

As this pilgrimage is less known than that of Jerusalem, and thus in a sense more picturesque, it may be relevant to describe it in somewhat greater detail.

The textbook-disputes take on a fresh vitality as one climbs onto the train which leaves Smyrna in the early dawn for Colossae (modern Denizli, not far from Hierapolis and Laodicea). The sense of wonderment is increased when one is surrounded entirely by Turks, who courteously offer a cigarette, then slip off their shoes and curl up their legs beneath them on the seat. At the station of Torbali, a short pause shows a Turkish village just waking into colorful activity. Soon afterwards the sight of ruined towers on a hillside to the right announces Seljuk, the station for "Efes."

RUINS OF URBAN EPHESUS

As the train resumes its course to Colossae, Seljuk itself is worthy of a brief delay. Its ancient church of Saint John perhaps gives its name to the locality: *Ayasuluk* a corruption of *hagios theologos*. From the crumbling turrets of its acropolis one gets a fine orientation-view of Pion, the hill of ancient Ephesus, some two miles away toward the sea.

If it is one's first visit to the Orient, the thought of our Lady will be at once vividly recalled at the sight of the modestly veiled Turkish girls, their dark eyes peering out to pick their way among the little donkeys on the jagged street. It is altogether the picture

Dagh was mentioned, neither better nor worse. If and insofar as the Ephesus claim has probability, the localization of Panaya Kapouli has a certain illustrative aptness, but to allude to it by way of proof is inadvisable.

RÔLE OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF SMYRNA

Once dotted with flourishing bishoprics, the Christianity of Asia Minor has now so dwindled that even once-great Ephesus has become a part of the See of Izmir. The "angel of the church of Smyrna" is today Archbishop Giuseppe Descuffi, successor of Saint Polycarp. An Italian born in Istanbul, he was for thirty years professor there in the college and seminary of Saint-Benoît, and is now nearing completion of his difficult new Turkish version of the Scripture.

Like his predecessor of *Apoc.* 2:9, the Archbishop of Smyrna is rich in his poverty and tribulation. In a suspicious and unsympathetic milieu, his persevering scholarship and gracious cordiality shine out as in a chosen frame.

Of the Turkish regime, it must be said that it nowadays treats the plainest Americans with appreciative deference. If one's freedom of movement is irksomely restricted by a silken mesh of surveillance, it requires no insight to see that this is not unfriendliness but simply terror of Red infiltration. The ordinary Turks show a naïve helpfulness and religious respect which is in the most charming oriental tradition.

But far beneath this spontaneous graciousness there is a deep-smouldering resentment of the suspected politico-religious intrigues of foreigners, religion masking espionage in time of war, and commerce masking proselytism in time of peace. This hostility creates barriers of cruel futility to hamper Christian missionary efforts.

Archbishop Descuffi is conscious of the peculiar responsibilities which this milieu imposes on him as upholder of a rich apostolic tradition. Whereas at Jerusalem a sacred site can be unremittingly examined by the microscopes of scholarship, here excavations are rare and difficult. There, enthusiastic pilgrims observe and publicize uncounted shreds of detail, sometimes relevant; here, pilgrims are few and tethered. Thus the burden of sustaining from oblivion the Ephesus tradition falls upon his shoulders. He must see to it that ancient witnesses are conserved, new techniques applied, and undeserved opposition parried. Moreover there is the question of

fitting honor to be paid. Just as a host-particle cannot be casually flung aside if it be only slightly probable that it has been consecrated, so the Marian sacredness of Ephesus deserves a modest hyperdulia in proportion to its modest probability.

With old-world courtliness this amiable prelate welcomes the Christian visitor to Izmir. His sympathetic and spiritual-minded conversation is sure to gravitate toward the subject of our Lady's Assumption. With a modest reasonableness equaling that of Père Abel, he will point out that the Jerusalem claim is indeed more solidly founded and in many ways more acceptable. But oversimplifications are to be avoided; the claims of Ephesus have their own title to respect. What has been said fifteen centuries ago can never be unsaid; it can only be explained; and the ultimately adequate explanation has not up till now been found. The pilgrim is suavely brought to a realization that he will gain much from interpreting his visit to Ephesus in this Marian light, not as a fact, but as a possibility.

As this pilgrimage is less known than that of Jerusalem, and thus in a sense more picturesque, it may be relevant to describe it in somewhat greater detail.

The textbook-disputes take on a fresh vitality as one climbs onto the train which leaves Smyrna in the early dawn for Colossae (modern Denizli, not far from Hierapolis and Laodicea). The sense of wonderment is increased when one is surrounded entirely by Turks, who courteously offer a cigarette, then slip off their shoes and curl up their legs beneath them on the seat. At the station of Torbali, a short pause shows a Turkish village just waking into colorful activity. Soon afterwards the sight of ruined towers on a hillside to the right announces Seljuk, the station for "Efes."

RUINS OF URBAN EPHESUS

As the train resumes its course to Colossae, Seljuk itself is worthy of a brief delay. Its ancient church of Saint John perhaps gives its name to the locality: *Ayasuluk* a corruption of *hagios theologos*. From the crumbling turrets of its acropolis one gets a fine orientation-view of Pion, the hill of ancient Ephesus, some two miles away toward the sea.

If it is one's first visit to the Orient, the thought of our Lady will be at once vividly recalled at the sight of the modestly veiled Turkish girls, their dark eyes peering out to pick their way among the little donkeys on the jagged street. It is altogether the picture

with which we are familiar from illustrations in the life of Our Lady or scripture history.

One is struck by the difference of the situation here from that of Loreto, for example. At Loreto, on its lovely hillside dominating the Italian Adriatic coast, there is a massive magnificence of architecture and ornamentation attesting the devotion of many centuries to the four crumbling brick walls which are believed to have been the home of our Lady at Nazareth. Yet the basis of that belief involves a whole pageant of prodigies and improbabilities which sober judgment would summarily dismiss as fantastic, were it not for the authority of Saints and Pontiffs which claims at least a reverent consideration. Here at Ephesus, on the contrary, there is no gorgeous cathedral and no tradition of miracles to attract the imagination; only the perisistent inescapable consciousness of a possibility more awe-inspiring than any monument.

Descending the hill of Seljuk, past an impressive mosque, one pauses for a moment at the scarcely recognizable site of what was one of the seven wonders of the world: the temple of Diana of the Ephesians. It is interesting to recall that when the rich temple was burned down in 356 B.C. by the act of a madman who wanted his name (Herostratus) to be remembered forever, Alexander the Great offered to rebuild it magnificently on condition that his name be blazoned across the façade; but the people preferred to bear the expense themselves, saying that the glory belonged to their goddess and not to any prince. Not all places of cult have been so fortunately spared a donor's glorification.

From the temple of Diana it is a good long walk along the plain of Xenophon's Selenus, Marsyas, and Cayster rivers. Ancient Ephesus, which owed its importance to the wide mouth of the Cayster there, possessed an excellent harbor. When in the course of time the river mouth became choked up with alluvium and formed the wide swamp we see today, Ephesus was gradually abandoned. As if to compensate for drying up its channel, the river has poured its sluggish puddles back on Ephesus, so that much of the Arcade and Forum are now a murky overgrowth of thorny marsh-weeds.

The ramparts of Thracian Lysimachus (287 B.C.) weave along the summits of Mount Pion, and in climbing to their highest point another fine panorama is secured. The ruins are surprising chiefly by their vast extent: they cover several square miles, rambling up

and down the slopes of Pion and of the neighboring hills of Mount Coressus. The vastness is at first distressing to the climber, who expected something on the order of placid Pompeii or Ostia; but the better view from the heights is worth the price.

Immediately below stretch the two arms of the Sacred Way, paved in glistening marble slabs, joining the Agora to the Theatre and the Library. To the right is a monumental gate and the ruined "double church." To the left are a gymnasium and concert-hall, then ramparts and tombs stretching far down to the sea.

If from Pion's summit one advances forward, picking his way over the rocks, he comes out at the topmost ledges of the Theatre, an impressive ruin below him. The semicircular tiers of stone seats are overgrown with herbage, but the stage or arena lies plainly revealed. If this is not where Saint Paul "fought with wild beasts at Ephesus" in the literal sense, it was at least the scene of other gripping events in the career of the Apostle, and of early Christian martyrdoms. The thought of Paul recalls those unanswered questions of his possible encounter here with John, and with whoever may have been in John's company.

Climbing down to the stage, one finds in the marble masonry beneath it several tunnels leading to the Forum. Marked with inscriptions, they serve as a striking frame from which to view the ruins above and below.

The walk along the giant pavements of the Sacred Way evokes at every step the presence of the Apostle; but truth to tell, it is very difficult to imagine our Lady in such a lordly pagan setting. Her home could only have been far off on the hillside, in some remote and recollected spot such as is actually the Panaya Kapouli.

BULBUL DAGH AND THE CHURCH OF THE COUNCIL

It is not easy to find one's way over the piles of masonry and through the dense growth of weeds to the path leading to the "Prison of Saint Paul." This small fort, which has no apparent right to its name, gives a fine view out to sea, where the island of Samos rises at a distance. (Somewhat beyond it is tiny Patmos.)

Over the ridge of Mount Coressus is the little house, which serves as well as any other spot in the neighborhood to evoke for the imagination what the setting of our Lady's last days would have been like, in poverty and peace. Fonck describes its four walls, twelve feet high, divided into three rooms, built of the same type

of bricks as the Ephesus Gymnasium from the era of Claudius Caesar. The shrine is now a roofless hut in a kind of arbor among the hills looking westward on the sea. "I must confess," he says, "more than the historical interest in the world-renowned sanctuary of Diana unearthed [now 50] years ago, more even than all the biblical significance of the glorious city of the Ephesians, the new discovery attracted me to those hills, where perhaps there was still much to be learned of the stay of the august Mother of God."[28] It is hard not to share the same reverence, despite the numerous restrictions with which Fonck's thesis must be circumscribed.[29]

If the structure of Panaya Kapouli does not mark the specific spot of the Ephesus tradition relative to the Virgin's passing, still less do we have any inkling of the presumed site of her tomb. For this the imagination can only turn to one of the greatest monuments in the history of Mariology, the Church of the Council in Ephesus.

One returns there through fields, where a friendly Turkish farmer with his wide orange bandana flopping about his head follows his two oxen down a furrow. Though the earth is rich and black, it seems that the plow is pointing straight into a surface of crushed brick. The terrain is literally sown with sherds and tiles from the ancient town. How diligently the archaeologists have rubbed and scrutinized them to discover the words "School of Tyrannus," which would have marked the location of Paul's sojourn in Ephesus! More wistful still is the hope of an allusion to the home of John.

The "double church" is now generally admitted to be that of the Council of Ephesus in 431. "The style of this edifice, its orientation paralleling other ancient monuments, permits dating it as far back as the fifth century. In its enclosure was held the third ecumenical council, in 431. It is fashionable to assign a later date, even in the sixth century, to the edifice, but without plausible reason." The ground-plan and portions of masonry which remain are of proportions which would have suited it to that grandiose gathering. No remaining fragment suggests a tomb of either John or Mary.

[28] Fonck, *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LI (1896), 471, 477-9. For a picture of the house, see the frontispiece Niessen, *Panagia-Kapuli* (Dülmen, 1906).

[29] Heidet-Pirot, *DBSupplément*, I, 651, find the explanation of this shrine in that it was an old sanctuary of Diana later dedicated to Mary as adoptive mother of St. John, apostle of Asia.

Leaving the ruins by the front portal, one recalls the jubilant procession which set out, perhaps from there, at the close of the council, escorting the bishops to their homes and extolling the *theotókos,* Mother of God. In a sense at least this is Mary's city. Our Lady has become something of a myth in the flights of artists and orators, a peg on which to festoon all inferred perfections. A visit to Ephesus recalls that she was a woman holding a loose veil beneath her eyes as she picked her way among donkeys on a crooked street.

To look back over our comparison, by way of summary: (1) Any site which has a solidly probable claim to have been the last home of the mother of Jesus merits as such true veneration. (2) The Jerusalem tradition is altogether more internally reasonable and is today rightly and universally accepted. (3) Positive *a posteriori* proofs of the Jerusalem tradition are weak but better than those of Ephesus. (4) To rule out the claim of Ephesus altogther would be equivalent to suppression of relevant evidence. (5) More advantageous conditions of research might conceivably produce evidence capable of altering substantially the convincingness of either claim. (6) The Ephesus setting furnishes some few details to the imagination which fit the figure of Mary living in solitude better than what we see in Jerusalem. (7) More deeply satisfying is the thought of Mary living out her days beside the souvenirs of Jesus at the Cenacle. (8) The doctrine of the Assumption is not dependent upon the certitude attaching to any localized tradition.

ROBERT NORTH, S.J.

Rome, Italy

CHARITY AND INFUSED CONTEMPLATION

It is therefore impossible to have a high degree of charity without having at the same time and in a proportionate degree the gifts of understanding and wisdom, gifts which, together with faith, are the principle of the *infused contemplation* of revealed mysteries. In some of the saints, as in St. Augustine, this contemplation bears immediately upon the mysteries themselves; in others, as in a St. Vincent de Paul, it bears upon the practical consequences of these mysteries; for example, upon the life of the members of the mystical body of Christ. But in either case it is infused contemplation.

—Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, in *The Three Ways of the Spiritual Life* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1950), p. 105.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT: SALARY AND SPIRITUALITY IN THE PRIESTHOOD

The various phases in the life of St. Gregory the Great constituted for him a school of experience. They had a formative influence for the time when he took over the Apostolic See, the head of all the churches, and when the care of the entire Church was entrusted to him.[1] Motives proposed in his writings, in which he strives to foster what is good and to correct what is evil, have a definite relationship to lessons he learned from various phases of his career that formed his own life into one that could be held up as an example for all.[2]

The descendant of an outstanding Roman family, Gregory had for a short time exercised the office of Prefect of Rome.[3] This was an important formative influence for it sharpened the characteristic love for justice of this typical Roman and gave him a better appreciation from experience of discipline, good order, and the duties of officials whether they were imperial or ecclesiastical.[4] Abandoning his public career Gregory sought the quiet and peace of the monastery. Here we have the ardent mystic and contemplative. In this, the happiest period of his life,[5] Gregory was unknowingly preparing himself for the time when he was to exercise the highest office in the Church in the spirit of giving to others the fruits of

[1] *Epistulae*, 3. 30; 13. 50 (*Monumenta germaniae historica* [*MGH*] I, 188; II, 416). Cf. H. Grisar, "Der römische Primat nach der Lehr und Regierungs-Praxis Gregors des Grossen," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, III (1879), 655-93; N. Sharkey, *St. Gregory the Great's Concept of Papal Power* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950), pp. 20-43.

[2] L. Weber, *Grundfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen* (Fribourg: Paulus, 1947), pp. 76-81.

[3] For the life of Gregory, cf. F. Dudden, *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, 1905); P. Batiffol, *St. Gregory the Great*. Translated by J. Stoddard (New York: Benziger, 1929). On the office of prefect exercised by Gregory, cf. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933), 341.

[4] R. Aigrain, "Saint Grégorie le Grand," in A. Fliche—V. Martin, *Histoire de l'église*, V (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1947), 21; L. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[5] G. Lau, *Gregor der Grosse nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1845), p. 20; C. Wolsgruber, *Gregor der Grosse* (Ravensburg: Kitz, 1897), p. 33.

his contemplation.[6] Yet, whether he was wrapped in contemplation or deluged with work, civil and ecclesiastical, Gregory was always a very practical, common-sense Roman.

Gregory, the wise and prudent pastor of souls, in his striving to improve the people, knew that it was necessary to improve the priest.[7] The priesthood is a theme that is constantly recurring in his writings and letters.[8] The former civil official, now the highest ecclesiastical authority, could remind the ecclesiastical leaders of the necessity of living up to the duties of their office.[9] The monk and mystic, now the contemplative in action, was animated with a spirit of idealism,[10] and he could point out to those in the priesthood the most spiritual and sublime motives for priestliness, e. g. the dignity of the office,[11] the imitation of Christ,[12] the last judgment of the priest by the Shepherd of Shepherds. [13] However, Gregory the down-to-earth and common-sense Roman, with an absorbing and fine spirit of justice,[14] could marshal arguments for

[6] *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, 1. 5. 12-15 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 826 D-828 A).

[7] H. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, I (St. Louis: Herder, 1925), 52. Pope Pius X in his encyclical on St. Gregory the Great frequently stresses this. Cf. *Jucunda sane*, *ASS*, XXXVI (1903-04), 514, 525.

[8] Gregory's principal work is the celebrated *Regulae pastoralis liber* (*MPL*, LXXVII, 13-128). Fine résumés of his teaching are given in *Epistula* 1. 24 (*MGH*, I, 28-37); *Homiliae in evangelia* 1. 17 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1138-49). This latter is Gregory's sermon to the bishops, and is the only sermon on the Gospel delivered to a special audience. Pope Pius X thought so much of this that he urged the bishops to read it constantly, and to have it read yearly to their clergy during the time of the annual retreat. Cf. *Jucunda sane*, *ASS*, XXXVI (1903-04), 527.

[9] R. Aigrain, *op. cit.*, p. 21; Pius X, *ibid.*, pp. 525 ff.

[10] L. Weber, *Grundfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen*, p. 72.

[11] *Reg. past.* 1. 10 (*MPL*, LXXVII, 23 AC). Here the nature of the office is described in Gregory's portrayal of the type of person who should undertake the care of souls. In the following chapter Gregory reverses the picture and points out the type of person who should not assume the priestly office.

[12] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 1-3 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1127 C-1128 C). This is Gregory's sermon on the Good Shepherd which is part of the office for the second Sunday after Easter.

[13] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 13; 17 (*ibid.*, 1145 CD-1148 B). It is interesting to note the use of this motive in Pius X's encyclical on the clergy in Italy. Cf. *Pieni l'animo*, *ASS*, XXXIX (1906), 321.

[14] H. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, I, 229 f.; L. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

priestliness from the very prosaic reality of a salary. It amounted to this: as priests you are receiving support; this obliges you to be priestly.

Gregory starts off by simply stating the fact that the priest obtains his livelihood from the offerings of the faithful.[15] In this regard Gregory stresses the confidence with which the priest should be animated. He should have such a confidence in God that he has no doubt whatsoever that his earthly livelihood will not be lacking to him even though he does not provide for it. In fact, it is important that he be not occupied with supplying his own livelihood because preoccupation with such a concern cuts in on his work of providing others with spiritual and eternal goods.[16] In receiving his sustenance in this way the priest has no need to apologize. His upkeep is not mere charity. It is something that is due him, something to which he has a just and lawful claim. On this Gregory is insistent. Christ Himself, Gregory notes, stipulated this when He told the disciples to eat and drink in the house they entered, when He declared that the laborer is worthy of his reward.[17] Commenting on this Gregory declares: "If our message of peace is received it is right that we should remain in the same house, eating and drinking the things that are there. It is right that we should receive earthly support from those to whom we offer the treasures of heaven."[18]

The laborer is worthy of his reward; the reward demands that one be a laborer. This is the theme that Gregory delights in developing. It is in this connection that Gregory brings forth thoughts that are truly sublime and inspiring, and from which he proceeds to draw some very practical conclusions. On the one hand there is the reward, on the other hand there is the work and labor. Before discussing the reward something must be said about the work and labor. Gregory often speaks of the work under the general heading

[15] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1142 B). When speaking of the support received by the priest, Gregory refers to it as *subsidium, sustentatio, stipendium.* For the use of the word "salary" as applied to the support of priests, cf. K. O'Brien, *The Nature of the Support of the Diocesan Priests in the United States* (Canon Law Studies 286 [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949]), 18, n. 29. See also chap. 1, "The Support of the Priests in the Primitive Church," *ibid.*, 1-10.

[16] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 5 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1140 D).

[17] *Luke* 10:7.

[18] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 7 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1141 C).

of preaching. He himself says: "Whoever enters the priesthood undertakes the office of a herald . . . if a priest does not know how to preach, what cry of warning can a speechless herald give?"[19] Formal preaching is embraced under the general heading of *praedicatio*. Along with this Gregory includes private instructions, talks and exhortations to individuals.[20] Furthermore, he has in mind good example, for preaching is genuine and complete when the priest preaches not only by his words but also by his actions, when his teaching is illustrated in his own life.[21] In general, preaching embraces the entire life of the priest as a teacher.[22]

This is the work of the priest for which he merits a reward. Expanding on the nature of the reward, Gregory points out that the earthly livelihood of the priest is already a part of the reward for his labor. The reward for his ministry begins on earth with the support that he receives; it is completed in heaven in the Beatific Vision.[23] Enlarging on this theme, Gregory states: "We should consider that a two-fold reward is due to one and the same work. One reward is received on earth; the other in heaven. One sustains us in our ministry; the other recompenses us in the resurrection."[24] However, there is a very definite relationship between the two rewards, between the support received on earth and the glory of heaven. The effect of the earthly reward should be that the priest strives all the more zealously and energetically for the reward to come. The true and genuine priest does not preach and work to receive the reward of this life, but he should accept the reward that he may be able to carry on his work of preaching. One

[19] *Reg. past.* 2. 4 (*MPL*, LXXVII, 31 A); *Moralium libri sive expositio in librum beati Job* 22. 22. 53 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 246 C).

[20] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 9 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1143 A). In the third book of the *Regula pastoralis* Gregory gives instructions for adapting oneself to people of various types, temperaments, and characters. This is very similar to the exposition on the same subject given by St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Cf. *Oratio* 2. 26-34 (*MPG*, XXXV, 436-441).

[21] *Reg. past.* 1. 2; 1. 10; 2. 3 (*MPL*, LXXVII, 15 C; 23 B; 28 B). Gregory insisted on this in season and out of season. Cf. L. Weber, *Grundfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen*, p. 82. In proposing this ideal to the priest in the modern world Pope Pius XI brings forth the teaching of St. Gregory. Cf. *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, *AAS*, XXVIII (1936), 22.

[22] *Hom. in Ezech.* 2. 9. 6 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1046 A).

[23] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 7 (*ibid.*, 1141 D).

[24] *Ibid.*

who preaches to receive here the reward of praise or temporal support undoubtedly deprives himself of the eternal reward.[25]

The consideration of the support and livelihood of the priest leads Gregory to a discussion of his spirituality and zeal. Above all, Gregory wanted zealous laborers in the priesthood as is seen from his outcry: "Behold! The world is full of priests but it is very rare that we find a worker because we have undertaken the priestly office but we do not fulfill the work of that office."[26] The consideration of the priesthood as a whole called for and demanded workers. However, Gregory saw a special claim to work by reason of the title of the support received by the priest, and he thought that it was a disgrace to receive a reward and not to be a worker. In this connection Gregory goes on to say: "Consider what a crime it is to receive the reward for work without working. Behold, we obtain our livelihood from the offerings of the faithful, but what work do we do for the souls of the faithful?"[27]

After speaking in general on the obligation of a zealous priesthood by reason of the support received by the priest, Gregory goes on to specify this obligation by linking it up with sin. He draws a parallel between the offerings of the faithful and the sin-offerings of the Old Testament, from which the priests were allowed to participate.[28] Developing this thought Gregory states: "We receive as our salary those things which the faithful offered for the remission of their sins. Nevertheless, we do not, as is fitting, wear ourselves out in counteracting these very sins by our diligence in prayer and preaching."[29] After speaking against priests who hardly ever correct anyone openly, or who connive at the wickedness of men of influence lest they withdraw their contributions, Gregory continues:

[25] *Ibid.* (1142 A); *Moral.* 19. 14. 22 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 111 A).

[26] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 3 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1139 CD). It was in connection with these words that Pope Pius X said: "How powerful would the Church be today if it had as many workers as it has priests." Cf. *Jucunda sane*, *ASS* XXXVI (1903-04), 527.

[27] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1142 B).

[28] *Lev.* 6:25 f.

[29] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1142 B).

We must constantly recall to mind what Scripture says of such priests: *They shall eat the sins of my people.*[30] Why are they said to eat the sins of the people if it is not because they encourage the sinning of the wicked lest they lose their temporal support? We also who obtain our livelihood from the gifts of the faithful, which they offered for their sins, undoubtedly eat their sins if we eat and keep silent. Therefore let us consider what a crime it is in the eyes of God to eat the ransom for sin and to do nothing in counteracting sin by our preaching.[31]

In developing his theme on the necessity of spiritual zeal for temporal recompense, Gregory goes on to build up arguments centered around texts from the Book of Job. Aptly does he apply to the priesthood the words: *If my land cry out against me.*[32] According to Gregory the priest is one placed over the people for the common good. By the fact that he has authority over those committed to his care, the priest, as it were, owns land that is to be cultivated. By God's will he is placed over others in order that the souls of the subjects, like the soil of the field, may be fructified with seed, in this case the seed of preaching. However, the land cries out against its owner when the Church has a just reason to complain about him who is placed in authority over others.[33] Since his very position is given him that he may plant the seed of preaching, the complaint is especially concerned with one who does not carry out the duties of his office by teaching and preaching. This is brought out all the more clearly when Gregory proceeds to give his comments on the following words from Job: *If I have eaten the fruits thereof without money.*[34] Here Gregory shows the absolute necessity of work on the part of those who receive their livelihood from the Church and from the faithful. Commenting on this text Gregory goes on to say:

[30] *Osee* 4:8. Cf. J. Lippl-J. Theis, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1 Hälfte (Bonn: Hanstein, 1937), 41.

[31] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1142 C).

[32] *Job* 31:38.

[33] *Moral.* 22. 21. 52 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 245 B); *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*ibid.*, 1142 C).

[34] *Job.* 31:39.

To eat the fruits of the land without paying for them is to receive support from the Church without offering the Church pay in the form of preaching. . . . Therefore he eats the fruits of the land without paying for them who takes the ecclesiastical benefits but who does not offer the people the ministry of exhortation. . . . We demand what is due for our bodily support but in return we do not do what we should for the souls of our subjects. . . . Thus he who is placed over the people, whether they be many or few, owes this to Almighty God, namely, that he demand from his subjects the service due him in such a way that he himself is always carefully attentive to what he owes them in the way of exhortation.[35]

The good priest is one who gives himself up to a zealous apostolate in return for his temporal livelihood. Giving a picture of such a priest Gregory writes:

The good owner does not eat the fruits of this land without paying for them because the prudent and considerate pastor offers the ministry of preaching so as not to take, to his damnation, the revenues received from the Church for his upkeep. We eat the fruits from our land by paying for them when we take the revenues of the Church and give ourselves up to the work of preaching.[36]

Gregory clearly shows that the livelihood received by the priest demanded and called for a priestly life of zeal and holiness. On the one hand there is the priest's temporal support, on the other hand there is his work for souls. Gregory, however, was not merely satisfied with pointing out the obligation of work for souls in return for temporal livelihood. He also insisted that the priest be animated with the proper motives, that he have a true sense of proportion on the relative value of temporal support and zeal for souls. Zeal for souls made one a shepherd, primarily concerned with the interests of the flock; love for a temporal livelihood and material advantages[37] made one a hireling, concerned solely with the pay he was to receive. Gregory well says that those who love earthly possessions more than the sheep lose the name of pastor.[38]

[35] *Moral.* 22. 22. 53 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 246 CD-247A).

[36] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 8 (*ibid.*, 1142 D-1143 A).

[37] See the denunciations of Pius X and Pius XI, against one animated with such a motive, contained in their encyclicals on the priesthood. *Haerent animo, ASS,* XLI (1908), 562; *Ad catholici sacerdotii, ASS,* XXVIII (1936), 40.

[38] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 1 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 1127 D).

Gregory brings out his teaching on proper motivation by castigating those who are animated with base motives. Describing such a person Gregory writes:

> He is called not a shepherd but a hireling who feeds the Lord's flock not from a deep-rooted love, but for temporal rewards. He is indeed a hireling who holds the office of shepherd but who does not seek the good of souls. Such a one eagerly longs for earthly emoluments, rejoices in honor and precedence, delights in temporal recompenses, and is elated with the reverence bestowed upon him by men.[39]

Honor, preeminence, reverence, and recompense are the things after which the hireling strives. Receiving them as his reward here on earth, he ends up by being deprived of the shepherd in heaven, and by being cut off from the eternal inheritance of the flock.[40]

It is not always easy to tell whether one watches over the flock with the spirit of a shepherd or that of a hireling. However, there is one test that can be used to determine this, and that is the attitude of the priest when the safety and welfare of the flock is endangered. In the language of the Gospel, the attack of the wolf shows whether one stays at his post as a shepherd or abandons it like a hireling. These attacks may take the form of injustices perpetrated against the flock by the wicked. In such a case he who is merely a hireling flees. He flees not by giving up his office, but by taking to silence, by refusing to cry out against injustice, by refusing to defend the flock committed to his care.[41] On the other hand these attacks may come from the devil who seeks the ruin and death of souls. The hireling flees by not crying out against sin, by not looking to the spiritual welfare of his flock. Interested in the temporal advantages of his office, and not motivated by a deep-rooted love for souls, he is unmoved by the spiritual harm inflicted on the sheep, and by his negligence he allows it to go on.[42] Those given over to his care stray away from God, and the hireling remains silent. In a spirit of careless indifference he watches them hastening on to hell.[43] It is the motive, therefore, that determines the

[39] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 2 (*ibid.*, 1128 A).

[40] *Ibid.*

[41] *Ibid.* (1128 B).

[42] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 3 (*ibid.*, 1128 CD).

[43] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 17. 14 (*ibid.*, 1146 A).

conduct. Gregory well says: "He who in the pastoral office loves not the sheep, but seeks earthly gain, cannot take a firm stand when the sheep are endangered."[44]

The priest who is a true shepherd is one who, while accepting his temporal livelihood, is completely dedicated to the service and welfare of his flock. In his love for the sheep he takes as his model Christ, the Good Shepherd and the Shepherd of Shepherds, who knew His sheep and who loved them so much that He laid down His life in sacrifice for them.[45] The genuine priest is one who is primarily concerned with souls; temporal advantages flowing from his office are merely secondary. This is brought out very aptly in Gregory's words to Marianus of Ravenna:

> Since I love you very much I urgently admonish you—give serious attention to this matter—not to be more zealous for money than for souls. You should give only a passing side glance to money; on the other hand you should labor whole-heartedly, and apply yourself more energetically to the care of souls. With constant vigilance devote your energy and attention to this work, because from the ministry of a priest Our Redeemer expects not gold but souls.[46]

In a word, the ideal of the priesthood is attained when one is "vigilant in the work of souls,"[47] when the priest realizes that he is "placed over the brethren for the good of souls."[48]

These words and admonitions of Gregory were given at a time when civilization was crumbling. Nevertheless, they are not the words of a defeatist, but the words of one who kept on building up in the face of the greatest difficulties. In a sense, Gregory and his

[44] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 3 (*ibid.*, 1129 A).

[45] *Hom. in evan.* 1. 14. 1 (*ibid.*, 1127 C).

[46] *Epistula* 6. 28 (*MGH*, I, 406 f.). Marianus, who was formerly a monk and abbott in Gregory's monastery, received many letters from Gregory. Often Gregory had to remind him of the necessity of joining the active life with the contemplative. On Marianus, cf. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II, 430; Abbot Snow, *St. Gregory the Great* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1924), p. 66.

[47] *Epistula* 5. 48 (*MGH*, I, 348).

[48] *Reg. past.* 2. 7 (*MPL*, LXXVII, 38 D). In inculcating the primacy of the spiritual in the activity of priests, modern popes have stressed this passage of the *Regula pastoralis*. Cf. Leo XIII, *Fin dal principio*, *ASS*, XXXV (1902-03), 264; Pius X, *Pieni l'animo*, *ASS*, XXXIX (1906), 329.

writings defy the limitations of a definite period.[49] Written *sub specie aeternitatis,* the writings of Gregory breathe a spirit of freshness, newness, and timelessness. It is this that makes them timely even today.[50] There is in them a ring of modernity. Perhaps the best way to see this is to go from the sixth to the twentieth century, from Gregory I to Pius XI. There is a remarkable similarity in the exhortation to priestliness given by Pius XI in the twentieth century and by Gregory I in the sixth century. Practically every point covered in this article appears in these words of Pius XI:

> Not less than by his chastity the Catholic priest ought to be distinguished by his detachment. Surrounded by the corruption of a world in which everything can be bought and sold, he must pass through them utterly free of selfishness. He must holily spurn all vile greed of earthly gains, since he is in search of souls, not of money, of the glory of God, not his own. He is no mercenary working for a temporal recompense, nor yet an employee who, whilst attending to the duties of his office, at the same time is looking to his career and personal promotion; he is the "good soldier of Christ" who "entangleth himself not with secular business: that he may please Him to whom he hath engaged himself."
>
> The minister of God is a father of souls; and he knows that his toils and his cares cannot adequately be repaid with wealth and honors of earth. He is not indeed forbidden to receive fitting sustenance, according to the teaching of the Apostle: "They that serve the altar may partake with the altar . . . so also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel." But once called to the "inheritance of the Lord," as his very title "cleric" declares, a priest may expect no other recompense than that promised by Christ to His Apostles: "Your reward is very great in heaven." Woe to the priest who, forgetful of these divine promises should become "greedy of filthy lucre." Woe if he is joined to the herd of the worldly over whom the Church like the Apostle grieves: "All seek the things that are their own: not the things that are Jesus Christ's." Such a priest, besides failing in his own vocation, would earn the contempt even of his own people. They would perceive in him the deplorable contradiction between his conduct and the doctrine so clearly expounded by Christ, which the priest is bound to teach: "Lay not up to yourself treasures on earth: where

---

[49] L. Weber, *Grundfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen,* pp. 14 f.

[50] Pius X, *Jucunda sane, ASS,* XXXVI (1903-04), 525, 527, 529.

the rust and moth consume and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up to yourselves treasures in heaven." . . .

On the other hand, by sincere disinterestedness the priest can hope to win the hearts of all. For detachment from earthly goods, if inspired by lively faith, is always accompanied by tender compassion towards the unfortunate of every kind. Thus the priest becomes a veritable father of the poor . . .

Thus the Catholic priest is freed from the bonds of a family and of self-interest—the two chief bonds which could bind him too closely to earth. Thus free, his heart will more readily take flame from the heavenly fire that burns in the Heart of Jesus; that fire that seeks only to inflame apostolic hearts and through them "cast fire on all the earth." This is the fire of zeal. Like the zeal of Jesus described in Holy Scripture, the zeal of the priest for the glory of God and the salvation of souls ought to consume him. It should make him forget himself and all earthly things. It should powerfully urge him to dedicate himself utterly to his sublime work, and to search out means ever more effective for an apostolate ever wider and ever better.[51]

It would be wrong to say that Pius XI is merely the echo of Gregory I. Both echo of the pastoral exhortations of Christ, St. Peter, and St. Paul; both are the expounders of the teaching on the priesthood contained in the deposit of revelation. St. Gregory expounded in the sixth century; Pius XI proclaimed it in the twentieth century. As such they are witnesses to the work of the Church through the centuries of constantly holding up the ideals of priestliness,[52] and of striving to make the priest an *alter Christus,* a human replica of Christ, the High Priest, the Good Shepherd, the Shepherd of Shepherds.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[51] Pius XI, *Ad catholici sacerdotti, ASS,* XXVIII (1936), 28 ff.

[52] *Enchiridion clericorum. Documenta ecclesiae sacrorum alumnis instituendis,* Vatican Press, 1938.

THE RECENT MARIAN CONGRESS AT LE PUY-EN-VELAY

The readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* are already aware of the contemporary theological trend in connection with the Assumption of Our Lady. They have been following from a a distance, but with keen interest, the animated discussions of the mariological assemblies held in recent years at Monserrat (1946), Rome (1947), Lisbon (1947), Madrid (1947), Montreal (1948), Lyons (1948), Buenos Aires (1948) and Salamanca (1949). The latest in this remarkable series of conventions is the one recently held at Le Puy-en-Velay in France (Aug. 11-15, 1949). It was sponsored and organized by the Franciscan Provinces of France and Belgium under the presidency of His Excellency, Joseph M. Martin, Archbishop of Rouen and Primate of Normandy. The proceedings of the convention, just off the press,[1] contain no less than eleven dissertations—all of them written by well-known specialists—on the various aspects of Our Lady's Assumption and its definability. It is about these that the writer has been requested to say a few words for the benefit of *AER* readers.

The brochure opens with a conference by the Abbé A. Fayard, professor at the seminary of Le Puy, on the Assumption in the Gallican and French Liturgies (pp. 29-45). The author claims, against Fr. Jugie,[2] that the feast of the Assumption, as found in the Gallican Missal, was celebrated in Gaul almost one hundred years before it was introduced into the Roman liturgy by Pope Sergius I towards the end of the seventh century. However, he rejects as exaggerated the opinion advanced recently by Prof. E. Bourque[3] according to whom the feast actually dates back to the sixth century. At any rate, both the Gallican Liturgy in the seventh century and the French Liturgy in the eighteenth, although formulated according to quite different patterns, give sufficiently clear testimony to Mary's death, resurrection and bodily glorification in

[1] *L'Assomption de la Très-Sainte Vierge. Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1950).

[2] M. Jugie, *La mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge* (Città del Vaticano, 1944), p. 195.

[3] E. Bourque, "Le sens de l'Assomption dans la liturgie," in *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montréal, 1948), p. 162.

heaven. As to the extremely delicate question of the interdependence between the Gallican Liturgy and the apocrypha, the author is of the opinion that the latter were not the first manifestations of the belief in the Assumption, as some scholars would have us believe. They merely elaborate on a more ancient theme. The Gallican Mass does utilize the apocrypha, but it does not depend on them. Its affirmation of Mary's Assumption is based on her other prerogatives, such as her immunity from sin, the divine maternity and Mary's role as the "Second Eve" intimately associated to the mission of the "Second Adam."

The second paper, of local interest, is entitled "The Assumption in the Diocese of Le Puy" (pp. 47-55). The author, Abbé André Chanal, undertakes to show how from the beginning of the sixteenth century the feast of Mary's integral glorification has been celebrated in Le Puy with a solemnity similar to that of Christmas and the Epiphany. The belief officially expressed in the ancient missals and catechisms of the diocese is furthermore corroborated by numerous artistic manifestations, particularly in the field of sculpture and painting.

One of the most substantial dissertations in the symposium is that by Dr. Celestin Piana, O.F.M., on Our Lady's Assumption according to the Franciscan School of the fifteenth century (pp. 52-100). The author, an erudite medievalist of the Quaracchi caliber, is already well known for his noteworthy contributions to the history of the Assumption in the Middle Ages.[4] Here he passes in review a large number of representative Franciscan writers, some of whose works are still unedited, and discovers in them an amazing unanimity as regards the various elements or aspects of the doctrine under discussion. They not only adhere tenaciously to Our Lady's bodily glorification in heaven, but also to the belief that she actually died. The idea of Mary's so-called immortality was simply unknown to them. The doubts and hesitations of Pseudo-Jerome, which exerted so much influence on other writers, seems never to have found favor within the Franciscan School. The dissertation is followed by two appendices with excerpts from the unpublished sermons of St. John Capistran and those attributed to Anthony of Bitonto.

[4] Cf., for example, his book *Assumptio B. Virginis Mariae apud scriptores saec. XIII* (Rome, 1942).

The contribution of the Netherlands to the development of the doctrine of the Assumption had never been treated *ex professo* up to the present time. This difficult task was assigned to Dr. Aquilin Emmen, O.F.M., of the Dutch Franciscan Province (pp. 101-124). The learned author makes an interesting survey as to the origin and gradual evolution of the "fides pia" from the beginning of the twelfth century to the end of the sixteenth and notes that while theologians showed a good deal of reserve and even doubt concerning Mary's prerogative, the faithful professed the doctrine in no uncertain manner. In fact, he points out, it was due to the influence of the latter (not of the theologians) that the belief gradually became *doctrina communis* in the sixteenth century.

One of the thorny questions being debated today in connection with Our Lady's Assumption is that of her so-called immortality *de jure* and *de facto*.[5] The complex problem is now thrashed out anew and with rare competence by Prof. Charles Boyer, S.J., dean of the School of Theology at the Gregorian University in Rome. In a remarkable paper entitled "The Reasons for the Death of the Blessed Virgin" (pp. 125-34), the noted theologian shows how the dogma of the Immaculate Conception does not postulate, as some think, Mary's immortality. In good logic, he says, all that we can infer from the dogma is that Mary's death was not due to original sin. But her death could be demanded by other reasons, for example, her rôle as coredemptrix of mankind. Christ and Mary were predestined to overthrow the power of Satan in the *selfsame* manner. The prophecy of *Gen.* 3:15 requires it. Hence she had to die, not only because of her human condition, but also in imitation of her divine Son in His capacity as Redeemer of the world. The author is so convinced of this doctrine that he would not deny its definability as a dogma of faith.

Well deserving of mention is likewise the contribution by Dr. Luke Laurent, O.F.M., on the nexus between Mary's divine maternity and her Assumption (pp. 135-50). A good deal has already been written on the subject and, of course, *unusquisque in suo sensu abundat.* Is the doctrine of Mary's bodily glorification *implicitly revealed* in the dogma of her divine motherhood? Some, like Fr. E. Esteve and Dom Frénaud, see a necessary and intrinsic

[5] Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., "The Mariological Movement in the World Today," in *Marian Studies*, I (1950), 41 f.

nexus between the two. Others, like P. Renaudin and J. Coppens, appear quite skeptical as to the value of such an argument. Others, finally, like E. Caggiano, C. Friethoff and C. Balić, are of the opinion that in the divine maternity we have only an *argumentum convenientiae* in favor of the Assumption. Fr. Laurent examines particularly the arguments recently exploited by Dom Frénaud and finds them somewhat weak. His conclusion is that none of the arguments generally brought forward in order to prove the so-called intrinsic and necessary connection between the two doctrines exceeds a very high degree of fittingness.

The next paper in the brochure is entitled "Assumption and Co-redemption" (pp. 151-73). Its author, Prof. H. Rondet, S.J., endeavors to bring out the intimate nexus between these two Marian prerogatives, but in a rather unique way, namely, by taking as a starting point the fact that Our Blessed Lady is the figure and résumé of the whole Mystical Body of Christ. In *this* sense, he states, coredemption postulates the Assumption. The author is preoccupied with the idea of the Church. Hence a good deal of the paper is devoted to the sublime rôle of the Church in the divine plan of salvation. After all, the Church *is* Mary and Mary *is* the Church (!); both are coredeemers (!); both must share the complete victory of the Head. This so-called coredeeming mission of the members of the Mystical Body is the subject of a lengthy discussion, while comparatively little is said about Mary's prerogative, as the title of the paper had suggested. In fact, the author goes so far as to say that the classical argument of the association of the coredemptrix with the Redeemer in the latter's victory over Satan would lose much of its force if that victory were looked upon as Mary's *personal* victory. In order to have a clinching argument, he says, we must consider that victory as a triumph of the whole Church. But he fails to explain how it is that one and the same victory postulates an immediate and glorious resurrection in the case of Christ and Mary and not in the case of the other members of the Mystical Body. In our humble opinion, the author's exposé only spoils an otherwise apodeictic argument.

Fr. Rondet's paper is followed by two very enlightening conferences, not on the Assumption as such, but rather on certain questions which are intimately bound up with the present assumptionist movement, namely, on the nature and effects of a dogmatic definition, by Dr. Soiron, O.F.M. (pp. 175-88), and on the conditions

required for a *de fide* pronouncement, by Dr. Délesty, O.F.M.Cap. (pp. 189-209). The latter explains, among other things, the well-known controversy over the definability of theological conclusions and declares himself in favor of the opinion championed by the majority of scholastics, namely, that theological conclusions are definable by the Church. The author formulates his position as follows: a theological conclusion is definable if it has a necessary and evident nexus with a revealed premise and if it really corresponds to the faith of the Church, which is the guardian of the deposit of revelation (p. 209). According to Fr. Délesty, this is the traditional teaching of the Franciscan School and may claim the support of both St. Thomas and Scotus.

Perhaps the most important and substantial paper contributed to the convention is that by Fr. Jean-F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., S.T.M., on the definability of the Assumption (pp. 211-42). While we do not endorse all the assertions made by the author, we feel that his method of approach and particularly the evaluation he makes of current opinions on the matter are well deserving of the general reader's attention. The paper opens with a preliminary discussion as to the exact object of the common belief in Our Lady's Assumption. That object, contrary to what others may think, is fourfold and includes: Mary's death, the glorification of her soul, her resurrection and the glorification of her body in heaven. Since there is no controversy among Catholics as to the glorification of her soul, this aspect is passed over in silence. As to the death of the Blessed Virgin, Fr. Bonnefoy rightly concludes that the few theologians who have questioned it are simply going counter to a doctrine which has been unanimously taught in the Catholic Church since the beginning.

Having satisfactorily disposed of the arguments frequently advanced against this doctrine, the author enters the discussion proper: has God actually revealed the doctrine of Mary's death and glorious resurrection? If so, has it been explicitly or only virtually revealed? Do we find this revelation in Sacred Scripture or only in Tradition? This brings the author to the much disputed question concerning the "formally-implicitly" revealed. According to him, a truth is either explicitly revealed or only virtually so. Hence there is no such a thing as a "formally-implicitly" revealed truth. This, he says, would be a contradiction in terms, for the simple reason that "formal" is the same as "explicit," and "implicit" is

synonymous with "virtual." Besides, he adds, this unfortunate terminology *(formaliter implicite)* is the cause of a good deal of unnecessary confusion in theology and hence it should be abolished. Perhaps the author is correct; but until he undertakes to prove the above assertions, we shall continue to believe—with not a few theologians—that there *is* room for a third mode of revelation which is quite different from the explicit and the virtual and which we call "formal-implicit." Needless to say, this is hardly the place to enter into a minute discussion of this difficult and complex problem.

In answer to the further question: where is the Assumption revealed? the author begins by excluding Sacred Scripture as being utterly silent on the matter. In fact, while giving a résumé of the work accomplished at the convention, Fr. Bonnefoy states that "since other congresses had already sufficiently established the absence of *all* biblical data relating to the Assumption," it was unnecessary to treat this question again at Le Puy.[6] We regret to say that, while the author has a perfect right to his opinion on the matter, nevertheless, his appeal to "other congresses" is not very fortunate. It so happens that the biblical argument in favor of Mary's prerogative has been exploited *(aliter atque aliter)* by *all* the other assumptionist congresses known to us. We may mention, for example, those held at Nantes,[7] Monserrat,[8] Rome,[9] Lisbon,[10] Madrid,[11] Montreal,[12] and Lyons.[13] Fr. Balić was correct when,

[6] J.-F. Bonnefoy, "Le Congrès Marial du Puy-en-Velay," in *Marie*, IV, 1 (1950), 34.

[7] Cf. *Congrès Marial de Nantes* (Nantes-Paris, 1925), pp. 130 f. Cf. also *Crónica oficial del Congreso Mariano hispano-americano de Sevilla* (Madrid, 1930), p. 514 (A. Barros Errázuris).

[8] Cf. *Estudios Marianos*, VI (Madrid, 1947), 51-57 (M. Peinador).

[9] Cf. *Atti del Congresso Nazionale Mariano dei Frati Minori d'Italia* (Rome, 1948), pp. 477-82 (B. Mariani); pp. 595 f. (A. Marini); p. 695 (C. Balić).

[10] Cf. *Actas do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1948), pp. 33 and 44 (D. de Sousa).

[11] Cf. *Actas del Congreso Mariano Franciscano Español* (Madrid, 1948), p. 148 (C. de Pamplona).

[12] Cf. *Vers le dogme de l'Assomption* (Montréal, 1948), pp. 129 and 148 (F. Cayré); pp. 364 f. (A. Ferland); pp. 409 f. (C. F. De Vine); pp. 417 f. (B. Lonergan); p. 431 (G. E. Carter). On the views expressed at this Congress by A. Malo cf. *AER*, CXX, 5 (May, 1949), 379 f.

[13] Cf. *Assomption de Marie. Bulletin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales* (Paris, 1949), pp. 83 f. (H. Rondet).

speaking at the congress in Lisbon, he stated that "the majority of theologians today discover here [in *Gen.* 3:15] a revelation, and even a *formal* revelation, of the Assumption."[14]

Having dismissed the argument from Scripture, Fr. Bonnefoy passes on to Tradition; and here he rightly distinguishes between Mary's death and her glorious resurrection. The former, he claims, is a historical and dogmatic fact *explicitly* revealed and may be defined by the Church *de fide*. The basis for this opinion is that St. John the Apostle, who was constituted by Christ as Mary's guardian, must have known of her passing and must have also notified others about it. The express appeal made by the Greek Fathers of the seventh and eighth centuries to an oral tradition on the matter cannot be adequately explained unless we suppose an *explicit* revelation of the fact (p. 226).

As to Mary's resurrection, understood in its integral sense of bodily glorification, it is not a historical fact; it cannot be controlled by human means of investigation; it cannot be known except through divine revelation. But this divine revelation, according to the author, must not be understood in the sense of an apostolic tradition, for Mary's resurrection took place in the absence of witnesses. If there had been any witnesses, and if these witnesses had spoken, we could hardly explain the two following facts: the complete silence of the first four and a half centuries and the somewhat derogatory assertions made by some of the ancient writers and doctors of the Church concerning Mary's sanctity. If we add to this the well-known doubts and hesitations of not a few Catholic writers between the ninth and the sixteenth centuries, we must conclude that the hypothesis of an explicit apostolic tradition is devoid of solid foundation. How, then, can a definition of the doctrine be theologically justified? Fr. Bonnefoy answers: we must fall back on *virtual* revelation. This brings the author to a lengthy vindication of the definability of theological conclusions and, of course, to a tirade against those who still speak in terms of formal-implicit revelation.

In what specific truth is the Assumption virtually revealed? The author does not say. He undertakes an evaluation of the various "theological reasons" generally adduced in favor of the doctrine

[14] Cf. *Actas do Congresso Mariano dos Franciscanos de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1948), p. 170. Cf. also p. 174.

(divine maternity, virginity, etc.) and concludes that none of them exceeds the limits of mere fittingness. As to the arguments from Mary's rôle as coredemptrix, which is emphasized by most authors, Fr. Bonnefoy believes that it is not so strong as it is generally supposed.[15] And he gives the reason: when we say that Mary, as coredemptrix, is associated to Christ's victory over the devil, over sin and death we are dealing with "metaphorical formulae," and it is imprudent to use these as the major or minor premise of any syllogism. For example, if from the nature of Christ's victory over sin we try to infer the nature of His victory over death, we would have to conclude that He did not die at all, which is against faith. Hence, the author warns us, we must be extremely cautious in handling analogies and metaphors.

To the above observation it may be answered: (a) that if those "metaphorical formulae" create ambiguity when applied to Mary, they should create it also in the case of Christ. And yet we know from subsequent revelation, particularly from the teaching of St. Paul, that the "metaphor" of Christ's triumph over Satan conveyed a very concrete and specific reality; and (b) that the manner in which Christ overcame death cannot and is not established *a priori* or even from the nature of His victory over sin, but rather by taking into consideration the teaching of subsequent revelation on the matter. Now, we know from the New Testament that Christ's victory over death was not exactly the same as His victory over sin; we know, in other words, that He triumphed over death, not by not dying, but by not remaining dead, by rising again with a glorified body.[16] And precisely because Fr. Bonnefoy has overlooked this fact, his assertion that "victory over death" may be claimed *only* (!) by the just who will be taken up to heaven on the last day without undergoing death, does not seem to be to the point.

The author points out, furthermore, that it will not do to stress the fact that Mary's victory over death was perfect and complete. The reason is that *all* the just will completely triumph over death on the day of the general resurrection. Hence this privilege is not

[15] Elsewhere the author admits that this is one of the two "classical" arguments in favor of the doctrine. Cf. *Marie*, IV, 1, (1950), 35.

[16] Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M., *The Definability of Mary's Assumption*, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review, AER*, CXVIII, 3 (March, 1948), 176.

exclusively Mary's. To this one could perhaps answer that the argument questioned by the author is based, not so much on the degree of perfection or completeness of Mary's victory, as on the fact that her triumph is *identically the same* as Christ's, as we are taught by the magisterium of the Church.[17] Now the victory of the elect, however perfect, is not identically the same as Christ's; the former differs from the latter as the effect from its cause; they belong to two entirely different orders. To be sure, the victory of the Head is also—*attributive*—the victory of the members. But this attribution must be used cautiously and always in strict conformity with the analogy of faith; otherwise it may lead us to not a few heresies.

There are a few other observations of minor importance. We would note, for example, that it is not altogether correct to state, as the author does (p. 236), that Mary's victory over Satan "coincides" with the privilege of her Immaculate Conception. It is less correct to suppose that Mary's coredemption is co-extensive with her victory over death. The latter seems to be a result, or, if you wish, an aspect, of the former. If the author's statements were correct, it would necessarily follow the Immaculate Conception and the coredemption are substantially one and the same prerogative, which, of course, no one will admit. Furthermore, to say that practically everybody now agrees that *all* the theological reasons in favor of the Assumption are arguments of mere fittingness (p. 237) is at least questionable. Besides, the argument from Mary's coredemption (which the author includes in the above group) is much more than just a *ratio theologica* in the sense in which Bonnefoy understands that expression.

In this connection we note the ambiguity incurred by the author (p. 235, n. 52) when he takes Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange to task for stating that "the proximate and decisive theological reason" in favor of the Assumption lies in Mary's rôle as coredemptrix. Since for Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange the Assumption is *formally implicitly* contained in the doctrine of coredemption, Fr. Bonnefoy feels that the above statement is a contradiction in terms. But it is evident from the whole context that the eminent Dominican theologian is using the expression "theological reason" in the sense of "theologi-

[17] Cf. Pius IX, Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* (Dec. 8, 1854). Fr. C. Boyer brings out this same point in the paper discussed above (p. 130).

cal argument," "theological ground or basis," and not in the sense of theological *discursus* properly so-called, as Fr. Bonnefoy seems to think.

Having endeavored to show that none of the theological reasons in favor of the Assumption, when taken separately, verify the two requisites for a theological conclusion (i.e., metaphysical necessity and evidence), Fr. Bonnefoy goes on to point out that, if taken together, they do suffice to warrant a dogmatic definition of the doctrine. In other words, the *convergence* of all these theological reasons (Immaculate Conception, eminent sanctity, divine maternity, perpetual virginity, etc.) is strong enough to carry conviction to our intellect. This is particularly so, he continues, because of the fact that there are no weighty reasons militating against the doctrine under consideration. But the argument which settles the question, even when taken by itself and alone, is the undeniable fact of the universal belief of the Church in Mary's Assumption. As far as Catholics are concerned, Fr. Bonnefoy notes correctly, this is more than sufficient to justify a definition of Mary's prerogative. The ordinary magisterium teaches the Assumption as a *revealed* truth. Whether the Church believes that there is question of explicit or implicit revelation matters little. The author thinks that these are subtleties which preachers should never discuss in their sermons. How are we to explain the slow and laborious development of this belief which has now become universal? Fr. Bonnefoy answers: by the reflexion and the religious sentiment of the Christian people. The author need not elaborate on this; we are all well acquainted with the history of the Immaculate Conception which, at least in this respect, bears a striking similarity to that of the Assumption.

The last paper in the symposium is a lengthy dissertation on the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception (pp. 243-82) by the renowned medievalist Fr. Ephrem Longpré, O.F.M. Formulated in few words, the author's contention is that the doctrine of Mary's Assumption is a *necessary* sequel of her Immaculate Conception. He studies the theological concept of the latter prerogative from a twofold viewpoint, namely, the dogma solemnly defined by Pius IX in 1854 and the traditional teaching of the Scotistic School. The latter enlarges considerably on the former and adds new titles or reasons in favor of the Assumption; for example, Mary's predestination independent from that of Adam, the absence

of *all* debt of sin in her, and the possession of original justice in a degree eminently superior to that of Adam and Eve before the Fall. All these privileges necessarily and automatically render Our Blessed Lady immune from the necessity of dying (the *necessitas moriendi* considered as a sanction imposed by God as a result of original sin), and its various consequences, such as corruption in the grave and permanence in death until the day of the general resurrection. Of course, Mary freely and spontaneously renounced her right to immortality and willingly accepted the state of passibility and death so as to fulfill her office of coredemptrix (p. 256). The author endeavors to establish his thesis by a minute and penetrating analysis of the nature of sin and its necessary connection with death according to Sacred Scripture, and also by having recourse to Tradition.

As to the classical argument of Mary's indissoluble union with Christ in His victory over Satan (an argument which Bonnefoy finds rather weak), Fr. Longpré states that its demonstrative value is readily accepted by the Scotistic School (p. 276, n. 79). In fact, he adds, this argument differs only verbally from the proof of Mary's Assumption by her Immaculate Conception. In our opinion, it would be more accurate to say that Mary's share in Christ's unique victory proves both her Immaculate Conception and her Assumption; but this does not mean that the argument based on that victory is identical with that of the Immaculate Conception. As stated elsewhere, and *salvo meliori judicio,* they differ from each other as the cause differs from its effect.

The symposium which we have briefly reviewed, excellent though it be in many respects, will convince the readers once more of the considerable disagreement among Catholic theologians concerning the relative value of the arguments in favor of Our Lady's Assumption. Perhaps it will leave some readers perplexed and depressed. This fact, however, in no way detracts from the merits and noble efforts of the publication; much less does it cast any reflection on the scholarship of the eminent contributors. It should only serve as a new incentive to review the complex problem more carefully and perhaps even to reconsider certain views all too frequently taken for granted in many of our theological manuals.

JUNIPER B. CAROL, O.F.M.

St. Francis Monastery
New York, N. Y.

GENESIS I-XI AND PREHISTORY

PART III

The narrative of the "Tower" of Babel is most puzzling.[1] It looks like a fragment of tradition which the Author wished to preserve, but which was hard to fit perfectly into the context of Genesis. It tells us, as it is understood commonly, of the differences in languages and of the dispersion of mankind over the earth. Yet the table of nations just before in chap. 10[2] has given us the names of the peoples issued from the sons of Noe: we have been told already that they spread to different parts of the earth, forming groups with their special languages (10:5, 20, 31-32). The list of the descendants of Sem (10:21 ff.) is taken up again in the other genealogy of 11:10 from another point of view, to connect the history of Abraham (11:27 ff.) with Noe and thus with the earlier Patriarchs. But though the tradition of 11:1-9 supposes a state of things before the division mentioned in 10:5 ff., the Author inserted this narrative of the "Tower" in this place as apparently the most convenient: else he would have had to recast his sources in order to fit them more perfectly into an altogether coherent narrative. This account has no Babylonian parallel of any kind, and this is not very surprising. In fact it could hardly be of Babylonian origin. The text notes (vs. 3) the nature of the building materials—the only ones that were used in Babylonia and therefore would not be noticed especially in a Babylonian source. Nor would the fact that the land was a plain (vs. 2) be something remarkable to people living in the great flat land of Mesopotamia. And if the narrative is regarded as a satire on Babylon, as main-

[1] Cf. O. E. Ravn "Der Turm zu Babel," *ZTS. D.M.G.* (1937), 352-72; Albright, *Archaeol. and the Relig. of Isr.*, pp. 152-218; J. Chaine in *Mélanges Podechard* (see above), pp. 63-69; and cp. Vincent in *R.B.* (1946), 469, A. Jeremaias, *A.T.A.O.* (4), 182-96.

[2] Cf. Albright, *Archaeol. . . .*, pp. 134, 213. This list has been studied by the critics in the light of the information supplied by the ancient documents where several of the nations appear. Cf. Plessis, *D. B. Suppl.*, art. "Babylone," 762-72. It contains a notice from another source about Nemrod (vs. 8 ff.). Cf. Poebel, *J.N.E.S.* [1942], 256 f.; Albright, *ibid.* [1944], 254 f.; J. Thomas, *Mélanges d'histoire et de littérat. relig.*, pp. 287 ff.; G. Dossin, *Le Muséon* (XLVII), 107-21; *Biblica* [1927], 347 ff.

tained by some, we may hardly suppose a Babylonian origin. We may feel reasonably certain that if a Babylonian account of the differences of languages is ever found, it will be rather unlike this Biblical narrative.

It may be that the text of 11:1-9 is composite, as has been surmised by some in different ways (cf. Chaine *op. cit.;* also C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel* [1948], pp. 67, 335, 452, 499). However, this view involves much conjecturing; the result is not convincing, nor do all the difficulties disappear. It is safer to take the narrative as its stands, though with some minor texual changes proposed by Ravn (with Winckler).[3] We might, however, bear in mind the possibility of a distinction between a primitive tradition which explained the origin of the different languages, and the turn given to that tradition by the Author by means of the remark in vs. 9 applying the narrative to Babylon.

The narrative takes us back to a time when men still formed a single group with the same language and identical vocabulary. They are nomads.[4] Apparently they are coming from a mountainous country—at least it is noted that they arrive in a plain in the land of Sennaar, Southern Mesopotamia, where they decide to settle.[5] To carry out their plan of building a city and a migdāl (see below) they use the resources available in that plain: bricks baked thoroughly and therefore solid and lasting, which will replace the stone not found there, and bitumen, which takes the place of mortar. The city and the migdāl are to be on a vast scale since the purpose is to accommodate a considerable group of men and to

[3] *Vs. 4* "Let us build ourselves a city and make ourselves there a 'tower' [stronghold] reaching to the heavens lest we be scattered over all the earth" (Ravn with Winckler); thus, a transposition and a change of vowel in one word, viz. *there* (for: *name*). Some have tried to explain (for the unsatisfactory *name* of the text) a monument: on this, cf. B. Jacob, p. 298.

[4] It is difficult to say with certainty in which direction they are moving, as the text may be interpreted in two different ways: *"from* the 'East'" (so many, with Gk. and Vulg.); *"towards* the east" (so, many authors; also Ravn, p. 354). On either view, the text remains vague. A. Parrot, *De Bab.*, pp. 10 f., sees the Sumerians in the people who move from the east.

[5] Cf. Ravn, p. 356; Deimel in *Biblica* (1921), 77 ff.; (1927), 353 ff.; cf. Riessler in *T. Q. S.* (1930), 420; Dhorme, *R. B.* (1928), 507 f.

make provision for the future.[6] Yahweh, described in strongly anthropomorphic language, as in earlier narratives, yet as one whose will alone is powerful enough to upset the plans of men, breaks up the undertaking by destroying the bond that holds these men together, the identity of language. A popular etymology, connecting the name of the city of Babel with the Hebrew verb bālal (to mix) explains the confusion of languages which ruined man's dream of lasting unity.

The narrative makes no allusion to any plan of man to storm heaven. If this had been the point, we might have expected the author to bring it out more definitely. The fact is that the "tower" plays no special part in the account (cf. Ravn, pp. 364 f.; B. Jacob, p. 301). The story therefore bears no resemblance to the Greek myth of the Titans and similar tales in other peoples. The phrase which describes the migdāl as reaching up to heavens (v. 4: lit. "with its top in the heavens") is a conventional form of expression and implies no wicked design against the divinity. It occurs quite a few times in cuneiform literature where it conveys the idea of the very great height of a building.[7]

Chaps. 1-11 are a survey of the beginnings of mankind, religious, moral and cultural, but the religious, moral element predominates and may be regarded as the author's essential preoccupation. Adam loses God's friendship through sin and brings upon himself and his descendants moral and physical suffering. Cain becomes his brother's murderer. Lamech, trusting in his means of wreaking vengeance on his enemies, gives vent to feelings of fierce defiance. Man's wickedness increases to such a point finally that the Flood is sent to cleanse the earth. Polygamy contrary to God's original

[6] The *migdāl* of our text is explained usually as a "tower," hence "the tower of Babel" as the name of our narrative. Comm. find here an allusion to the Ziggurats of Mesopotamia; cf. A. Parrot, *De Bab.*, pp. 10 f.; G. Contenau, *Manuel d'Archéol.*, IV, 2102 ff. Ravn (pp. 363 f.) explains it as citadel, stronghold.

[7] Cf. the description of a temple by Gudea (Kg. of Lagash, S. Mesopotamia ca. 24th cent. B.C.) as "built up to heaven," "whose awesome splendor will reach heaven" (Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sum. a. AKK Konigsinschriften* [Lpg. 1907], p. 98 [9, 11, 15, 16]; also the texts of Nabopolassor [625-604 B.C.] and Nabuchodonosor [604-561] *ap.* Langdon, *Neubabl. Inschr.*, p. 60 [I, 32, 33, 36-41] and 146 [117-11]). The same thought is expressed more modestly in other texts by describing the top of the building as raised as high as a mountain: Langdon, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 138.

purpose is one of the signs of man's moral decline: Lamech introduces it by taking two wives (4:19); the "sons of God" do worse by taking as many wives as they pleased.[8]

Over against the growth of sin, we discern the application of the so-called process of elimination, by which the author gradually concentrates his attention upon the characters who will be the ancestors of the Chosen People: Adam, Seth, Noe, Sem, Thare, Abraham. The others are not chosen, and they are dropped after more or less lengthy remarks concerning their persons: they have no part to play in the history which is to become gradually the history of Israel.

This should not be construed as meaning that there is nothing but sin and evil on the one side, and nothing but virtue and good on the other side. We are used to looking upon the line of Cain as the sinful line and the line of Seth as the godly line (cf. the Commentaries on 6, ff.). This is simplifying matters too much. There are indeed sinners in the Cainite line. But is there any justification for supposing all its members alike sinful? Some of the steps in the development of material civilization are connected with them, but unless we imagine the author opposed to all material progress, we have no right to think that this progress is mentioned in connection with them as a proof of their growing demoralization and ungodliness. Nor does the author's silence about failings in the other line mean that they are regarded, all of them, as models of godly life. God's choice of the line does not guarantee immunity from moral and religious error. We know of the practice of idolatry at least in the case of Abraham's family, according to tradition (cf. *Jos.* 24:2, 14 f.: *Gen.* 31:19, 30, 53, 35, 2).[9] Therefore

[8] Reading: "wives all they chose," Ehrlich, p. 28; this means dropping one letter (M) before the word *all* in the Hebrew. For the monogamous idea in these narratives, cf. Ehrlich, p. 11 (on 2:21); p. 12 (2:24); p. 25 (4:22); p. 29 (6:2).

[9] Heb. has "judge" in pl.; LXX, Vulg., Sam., Heb., Pesh., have the verb in the singular: they understand the *one* God, who is the God of Abraham and Nabor.; the phrase *"the God of their father"* is a gloss explaining the preceding phrase in the monotheistic sense. If the phrase, lacking in the Greek, belonged to the original context, we should have: "the god of *our* fathers," as it is—corrected—in Pesh. In view of the texts which speak definitely of idolatry in Abraham's ancestry, we should render: "the God of Abraham and the gods *of Nabor.*" For the same view cf. v.gr. Rashi (d. 1105) and *Ibn Ezra* (d. 1167).

we should not oversimplify the outline sketched in these chapters by contrasting a godly Seth line and an ungodly Cainite line. As may be expected in any group of men, there was good and evil in both lines.

The author assumes the knowledge of the true God by the personages described in these chapters. The God who made man is the one who manifests himself to Adam, Cain, Henoch (5:21-24), Lamech (5:28-29), Noe; we conclude naturally that he remains known to man. Thus we have the idea of the continuity of the true religion which began with the very beginnings of mankind and continued through the Mosaic revelation and the work of the Prophets. Attributing such a view to the author could hardly be said to misunderstand his purpose or to read too much into his text. We shall come back upon the subject in the conclusion.

Yet in spite of our author's manifest interest in the religious history of mankind, there is a disconcerting absence of definite notices about worship in our texts. We have indeed the explicit mentions of the sacrifices offered by Abel and Cain (4:3 ff.) and by Noe (8:20 ff.), but otherwise there is no further reference to the matter. Evidently, this cannot be taken as meaning that there were no sacrifices. But perhaps more disconcerting is the absence of any specific remark regarding the origin and development of polytheism. In view of the author's interest in the origin of many other things of less significance from the religious standpoint, it is strange that he has nothing to say on the subject. There is indeed a mysterious text which has received the most divergent interpretations and which, among other explanations, has been taken to refer to the beginnings of idolatry, viz. 4:26. It is rendered usually: "Then men began to call on the name of Yahweh," or, as some propose, with a slight correction of the traditional Hebrew: "This one [Enos] began to call on the name of Y." How the text is understood by modern scholars, we shall see further on. What is of special interest is the manner in which the text was understood by an ancient Jewish tradition. St. Jerome already is acquainted with this interpretation. We find it in the Targums of Onkelos and of Jonathan, in the Midrash Rabbah, and, among Jewish commentators, in the great Rashi (d. 1105). All these agree in seeing in this text a departure from religion, more particularly a statement on the origin of idolatry. Thus Onkelos: "Then in his [Enos'] days men ceased to pray in the name of Y."; Jonathan: "This was

the generation which in his days began to err and made for themselves idols and called these idols by the name of the Word [*Memra*] of Y." Rashi sees here the beginning of the practice of "calling the names of men and the names of idols by the name of the Holy One —Blessed be He—to make them false gods and to call them divinity."[10]

This view, it is clear, supposes a good deal of reading into the text and cannot be defended as representing the real meaning of the passage. Besides, it would be strange if the author had noted the great religious error of idolatry in so casual a manner. We should see in this interpretation the answer to the question which occurred naturally to the ancient Jewish reader of Scripture. How did men fall into idolatry if they at first knew only one God? Modern students of the prehistorical age also have their problem in the history of religions, but their approach is quite different: how did monotheism arise? The Biblical texts affirm that monotheism came first.

On the usual rendering of the sentence, the statement is explained as saying that men began then to worship God under the name Yahweh. The allusion is to some organization of public worship in which this divine name was used. The name itself is especially significant. According to this notice the knowledge of the name is attributed to early mankind, while other texts (*Ex.* 3:13-15 and 6:2-3) trace the name to the time of Moses (cf. Skinner, *Gen.*, p. 127; C. A. Simpson, *Early Traditions* . . ., p. 60; Chaine, *Genèse*, p. 83).

It would be strange that, if the point were some kind of organi-

[10] For the texts, cf. A. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos* (Berlin, 1884); M. Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan* (Berlin, 1903); Midrasch Rabbah (on Gen.), XXIII, 6 (Eng. Transl. ed. by Freedman-Simon-Epstein [Lond.], I [1939], 196 f.; Rashi, *i. h. l.*). Reference may be made in passing to some peculiar interpretations. A. Geddes, *Critical Remarks* . . ., I (Pentateuch) [Lond. 1800], 60-61, proposes: "This man [Enos] aspired to be called by the name of Y." i.e. he "was the first man to claim divine honors." Accord. to Le Clerc (d. 1736) the sense is that Seth's descendants "began to be denominated from God, i.e. they were called God's children, to distinguish them from the children of men, or Cain's posterity." We may find the same view in Houbigant's translation (not explained in the notes), "tum primum coepēre homines Dei nomine appellari." This view is given as an alternative explanation in the note *i. h. l.* in the new Spanish translation from the Hebrew (*O. T.* by F. Cantera Burgos [Madrid, 1947]).

zation of public worship, the matter should be stated just in passing. This should be a matter of special interest to the Author and therefore we should expect some development. This view then is as improbable as that which finds the origin of idolatry in our statement. The other part of the explanation which emphasizes the use of name of Yahweh as a special point in the author's intention is equally improbable; nothing implies such an intention and therefore this notice has no particular value from the point of view of the sources of Genesis. The author is using a standing formula as may be gathered from the use of the phrase, "to invoke the true God" in praise or thanksgiving or petition, is "to call on the name of Yahweh" (*be šem Y.*), not to "call on the name of God (*be šem Elohim*). The latter form of the expression appears in texts referring to a false god as contrasted with the true God (cf. *I Kings,* 18:24-26; *Mi.* 4:5). The same observation may be made in connection with other verbs such as to prophesy, to swear, etc. That is to say, the formula of itself does not stress the name Y. as such, though of course it supposes its current use, and therefore it should not be stressed as having special significance in the literary analysis of Genesis.

For the explanation of the mysterious sentence we must look to the immediate context itself. "Then" refers, not to the times of Enos in general, but to the event mentioned just before, the birth of Enos son of Seth and grandson of Adam. The birth of Seth had been an occasion of rejoicing to Adam and Eve in their mourning over the death of Abel—and the loss of Cain condemned to wandering. Now the birth of a son to Seth is a new occasion of rejoicing: they may look to the future with confidence. They therefore express their gratitude to God and this is stated in a current form of expression (cf. *Ps.* 105:1; *Isa.* 12:4; *Ps.* 116:4, 13, 17, etc.).[11]

In favor of this interpretation, it may be said that it maintains a close contact between the sentence and its immediate context. Otherwise, we have an extraneous notice, the precise point of which is obscure, introduced so casually that it is impossible to see

[11] U. Cassuto. *From Adam . . .*, pp. 141 f. He remarks that the phrase can be rendered: "Then did they begin *again.*" The idea "again" is not always expressed in Hebrew. Thus "to build" may be also "to rebuild" according to the context: v. gr. *Ps.* 50: 20: to *re*build the walls of Jerusalem. Cf. *Ehrlich,* p. 18 (on 4:1).

here a statement of the "religionsgeschichtlich" and literary significance attributed to it by the critics. With the simplicity of the explanation adopted above may be constrasted the refined literary considerations supposed to have influenced the redactors or revisers through whose hands the text passed. And in the end, those revisers and editors left us in the presence of a riddle.

CONCLUSION

Several times in the preceding pages, various points of the teaching of 1-11 have been stated more or less fully. In our conclusion it may be advisable to sum up the religious content of this part of Genesis in a more coherent presentation.

In chap. 1 there stands out the doctrine of God as a personal being, distinct from the world; almighty, by whose will is all that is; all wise, whose works are good, that is, answering fully the purpose for which He has made them. This view of God is incompatible with any form of atheistic or pantheistic conception of the universe. It excludes all theories that would suppose the world to be a self-explaining, self-sufficient whole, existing of itself, independent of a cause. This teaching is self-evident and needs no elaboration. It excludes likewise all Polytheism. Our narrative knows only one God. The plural form of the word *Elōhīm* (God) and of the verb (let *us* make) cannot be used against this idea of the One God, as is recognized by commentators. The stars, the moon, the sun, everything else in which men have found divinities, all are for the Author nothing but works of God, dependent on Him, assigned their part in the orderly course of nature for the advantage of man. For man, the last and highest of God's works, His image, is the master of the universe, under God, evidently, but nevertheless he is the master: all things are under him and for him.

The next narrative, which is not really a new account of creation, though it goes over part of the same ground, deals more precisely with the origin of man. It gives us the same teaching in general, yet in a very different form, more popular, full of images and figures. The whole presentation may be termed naïve as compared with that of chap. 1, but this naïvete should not be misunderstood as implying any degree of simple-mindedness or crudeness of religious ideas. It is rather perfection of the literary art. For certainly those narratives are masterpieces of composition, full of fine psychological insight, and the author is a great inspired

teacher and a psychologist as well as a man of exceptional literary ability, able to convey his teaching in a simple, popular form. Man is, like all other beings, the work of God, with a material nature which he shares with the animals (2:18), recalled by his very name (2:7: Adam—*Adāmāh* [soil]); he has a higher nature which sets him far above all the animals: none of these can give him the companionship suitable to his nature (2:18-20). Thus, in a graphic way, man is presented as "the image and likeness" of his Maker, to use the more abstract expression of the other narrative. Woman, whose Hebrew name (*iššah*) recalls her intimate relationship to man (*iš*), fill the need of companionship (2:18 ff.). The graphic account conveys also the idea of woman's equality of nature and dignity with man along with that of a certain dependence on man. Thus, by God's will, marriage is established, and, we may say without betraying the mind of the writer (see above), monogamous marriage (2:24). From the very first, man is destined to work (2:5, 15). This work is hardly conceived as just recreational, it is rather intended to bring some advantage to man, to result in progress and higher cultural development (cf. Goettsberger in *Lex. Theol. u. K.*, I, 85). After his disobedience, by which he forfeited some of his privileges, the conditions of man's work are altered, but not the duty itself of work (3:17-19). (Cp. J. Coppens in *Eph. Theol. Lov.* [1941], 68-75). To sum up the teaching in a word, man is what he is, physically, morally, intellectually, by the will of God. Therefore any system of thought which ignores this fundamental aspect of man's natural dignity, and reduces him to the level of a slave endebted to the State for all he is and has, is absolutely incompatible with the Biblical doctrine of man taught in this narrative.

After his sin, man, who is not abandoned by God altogether, (3:15), sets out on his course of trial and error. Sin abounds and is punished by God's justice: the two outstanding examples are Cain and the Flood. After the Flood, sin will appear again. Man is weak and yields to temptation though there is no fatal necessity for him to fall. The idea that man is free may be seen in 4:6-7. The text conveys the idea in its present form, though the wording is peculiar and some corrections may be made which do not alter the general sense substantially: "Why are you angry and why are you downcast? If you do well, will you not feel confident? But if

you do not well, sin will be crouching at the door, its urge is towards you and you shall be ruled by it."[12]

Man learns by experience and improves his material conditions of life: agriculture will give him a more secure source of food; the domestication of animals will supply him with new steady resources, enabling him to live in a settled mode of life; the use of the metals will place at his disposal better instruments of work—and also of attack and defense; music will allow him to spend his leisure time more pleasantly; cities will be built where groups of man can live together; he will plant vines, the produce of which will help the amenities of social gatherings, even if it can be abused.

We discern another important idea running throughout these chapters. God has a purpose which is carried out gradually through the choice of one part of mankind, reducing the chosen group little by little, until the choice finally is narrowed down to Abraham, then, in the rest of Genesis, to Jacob the ancestor of the people of Israel. This is done especially by means of the genealogies. Putting the thought in more abstract terms, we find in these chapters the idea of the divine choice which plays so important a part in the religion of Israel. This gives a very special character to the historical outline of these chapters. We have here, in a concrete, popular form such as may be expected from an ancient Hebrew author whose very language is averse to abstract forms of expression, a philosophy of history, and a real history, naturally of a religious character. This view of the historical development of mankind implies evidently that God directs the course of events according to His plan, in view of the special end He has in mind. In other words, history is not a mere succession of incoherent events, nor a succession of necessary facts. There is a goal set by God and God guides the development towards that goal. Needless to dwell on the grandeur of such a conception which imparts to our narratives, in spite of their varied forms and the diversity of origin of their elements, a deeper unity based on the meaning of the facts seen by

[12] G. R. Driver *Journal Theol. St.*, XLVII (1946), 157-160. "Be downcast": lit., has your face fallen. "Feel confident": lit. (on correction), you will raise up your face.

the author. This in fact gives to our early narratives—as to the rest of Genesis—an immense superiority over any other ancient work of history.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1900, entitled "Organization of Classes and Studies in the Seminary" is contributed by Fr. E. R. Dyer, S.S. He insists that extra opportunities for pursuing ecclesiastical studies should be offered to talented seminarians in the form of special classes and guidance in supplementary reading. This plan could not be worked out, he adds, if the seminary professor were called on to teach several principal branches or were taken up with matters outside his class-work. . . . Fr. H. Heuser describes a Coptic manuscript recently found in Egypt, apparently a fragment of the apocryphal Gospel to the Egyptians. . . . Fr. J. McSorley, C.S.P., contributes a lengthy and scholarly article entitled "Protestantism and the Divinity of Christ." With numerous quotations he demonstrates that "wherever Protestantism prevails today there is present a frightful proportion of 'Christians' who are ready to maintain that the Son of God is not supreme and infinite; in a word, that He is not God in the sense which the Catholic Church has ever held and does hold." . . . A reply to a query in the Conference department states that the image of the Sacred Heart, separated from the figure of Christ, may be venerated privately, but may not be placed anywhere in a church in such a way as to render it the object of public veneration. . . . We are informed that a decision of the Sacred Penitentiary declares that the plenary indulgence for the Jubilee year 1900 can be gained by a person as often as he wishes for the benefit of the souls in purgatory, after he has gained it for himself. . . . The editorial staff welcomes the new periodical *Homiletic Monthly and Catechist,* soon to be published in New York, and expresses the hope that "it will not merely furnish ready-made sermons and instructions to be memorized, but will serve the purpose of enabling priests to write their own sermons and prepare their instructions with such heart-qualities in them as no book or magazine can supply."—F. J. C.

THE CHURCH AND GOD'S PROMISES

Today, when an unhealthy tendency to minimize the attributes and the dignity of God's Church on earth is manifest in some sections of ecclesiastical writing, it is more than ever imperative to elucidate and to stress the basic concept of this society. The confusion on the subject of the Church, engendered in great measure by a so-called irenic ecclesiology, will hardly be able to affect or to infect persons who are aware of what the deposit of divine public revelation has to say about the nature and the prerogatives of God's kingdom on earth. Since both the New Testament and the earliest monuments of Christian tradition frequently describe the Church in terms of God's promises to His people, there is no better way of gaining a basic understanding of the Church militant than by the process of investigating these divine pledges.

There were certain definite benefits which God asserted that He would give to the members of His supernatural kingdom on earth. According to the Acts of the Apostles, Our Lord Himself designated His disciples, the original members of His *ecclesia* of the New Testament, as the immediate recipients of these gifts. The basic favor was something which, according to the designs of divine providence, they were to receive in Jerusalem shortly after His ascension into heaven. "And eating together with them, he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but should wait for the promise of the Father, which you have heard (saith he) by my mouth."[1]

That promise (ἐπαγγελία), was, according to Our Lord, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the reception of the Holy Ghost's power, by which they were to be intimately associated with Christ in their capacity as His witnesses and heralds.

> For John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence. . . .
>
> But you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth.[2]

Exactly the same truth is brought out even more succinctly by the same inspired author towards the end of the third Gospel. The

[1] *Acts*, 1:4. [2] *Acts*, 1:5, 8.

Gospel according to St. Luke tells us that Our Lord spoke thus to the eleven and those that were with them: "And I send the promise of my Father upon you: but stay you in the city until you be endued with power from on high."[3] Thus the Gospel scene closes and the history of the Church militant in the New Testament begins upon the note of certitude that Our Lord's disciples, organized by Him around Him into a true and visible society, were to be in a special way the beneficiaries of God's favors.

The promise of the Holy Ghost, or of reception of the power of the Holy Ghost, the benefit mentioned explicitly by St. Luke as promised by God to the disciples and as actually conferred upon them, must be understood as the final and complete announcement of those favors which Our Lord Himself had pledged to His kingdom on earth. In promising to Peter the primacy of jurisdiction within His kingdom, Our Lord had asserted that the gates of hell would not prevail over that *ecclesia* within which Peter was to act as the unifying force.[4] The expression πύλαι ᾅδου meant either death itself or the powers of evil under the direction of Satan, the spiritual enemy of God and of His Church, although the latter significance is more probable.[5] In either event, however, Our Lord's words contain a promise of triumphant final survival for His *ecclesia* of the New Testament.

On the negative side, then, the promise of the Holy Ghost involved Our Lord's pledge that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church so as to destroy or to pervert it. On the positive side, Our Lord pledged His own presence within the company of His disciples until the end of time. He announced that this community, entrusted with His own commission to teach, baptize and govern, would have Him in its midst always.

> And Jesus coming, spoke to them saying: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.
>
> Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

---

[3] *Luke*, 24:49.

[4] Cf. *Mt.* 16:18 f.

[5] Cf. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, 8th edition (Paris: Gabalda, 1948), pp. 325 ff.

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.[6]

The promise of Our Lord's presence in the band of His disciples carried with it the certainty that His enemies would continue to hate and to persecute Him in His *ecclesia*. The fact that the world, considered as the body of unregenerate and unbelieving humanity loosely federated under the dominion of Satan, would continue its opposition to Christ by hostile efforts against His Church is definitely one of the promises of Christ to His followers, a promise which brings out in strikingly concrete fashion the intimate association of His members with their Head.

If the world hate you, know ye, that it hath hated me before you.

If you had been of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

Remember my word that I said to you: The servant is not greater than his master. If you have persecuted me, they will also persecute you: if they have kept my word, they will keep yours also.

But all these things they will do to you for my name's sake: because they know not him that sent me.[7]

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that the opposition to Christ in His Church, which Our Lord attributes to the fact that the men guilty of it do not know the Father, is not thereby something innocent, something done "in good faith," at least on the part of men who have heard Christ's message, according to Our Lord's own teaching. He thus speaks of those who are to oppose the Church because of its union with Himself.

If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin.

He that hateth me, hateth my Father also.

If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.

But that the word may be fulfilled which is written in their law: They hated me without cause.[8]

The promise of the Holy Ghost involved, not only the power to carry out Christ's salvific commission, it contained also that grasp

[6] *Mt.* 28:18 ff. [7] *John*, 15:18-21. [8] *John*, 15:22-25.

of His revealed and supernatural message which was requisite for the life of grace in this world. The group which received this promise, and which obtained the favor pledged by Our Lord, is actually His Church of the promises. This is what Christ said about the enlightening aspect of the gift of the Holy Ghost.

> But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that are to come, he shall shew you.
> He shall glorify me; because he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it to you.[9]

Although Our Lord promised to be with the company of His disciples until the end of time, He let His followers know that they would be deprived of His visible presence during the period intervening between His ascension into heaven and the day of judgment. This condition, however, was described as part of Our Lord's design to bring those who belonged to Him and who died joined to Him into his "Father's house." In other words, the company of the disciples on earth was, according to Christ's promise, the company which was to find its definitive place, and to continue forever in the glorious courts of heaven. It is thus that we must interpret these words of Christ.

> In my Father's house there are many mansions. If not, I would have told you: because I go to prepare a place for you.
> And if I shall go, and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and will take you to myself; that where I am, you also may be.[10]

Obviously the favors for which Our Lord prayed and which He asked His Father to grant to His followers must be considered in the light of promises made to the true *ecclesia*. In His sacerdotal prayer Our Lord petitioned the Father that His disciples might be brought together into a unity of which the divine unity itself is at once the exemplar and the end. He prayed "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us."[11] He begged that His followers might be one with Him: "I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one."[12] He willed and thereby promised them that they should be

[9] *John*, 16:13 f.
[10] *John*, 14:2 f.
[11] *John*, 17:21.
[12] *John*, 17:23.

with Him forever. "Father, I will that where I am, they also whom thou hast given me may be with me; that they may see my glory which thou hast given me, because thou hast loved me before the creation of the world."[13]

We would fail entirely to appreciate the nature of Our Lord's promises to His *ecclesia* were we to overlook the fact that these pronouncements are, in the final analysis, nothing more or less than the final and complete announcement of those favors which God had previously pledged to His chosen people, the members of His kingdom on earth. These promises had previously been made under the old dispensation, through the agency of God's prophets and of the patriarchs.

The original and basic promise of the kingdom is recounted in the book of Genesis. When God informed fallen mankind, in the persons of our first parents, of the fact of the redeemer who was to come, He designated the fundamental favor which, in the last analysis, all the other promises to the children of men were simply destined to explain more completely and explicitly. The seed of the woman, who was to crush the head of the infernal serpent that had triumphed over the human race,[14] was the one around whom all the organization of God's kingdom on earth was to center. During the course of the ages, new information about this rescuer of humanity was integrated into the fabric of divine public revelation. It became known that the redeemer was to be one of the descendants of Abraham, and that all the kindred of the earth were to be blessed in him.[15] God informed His people that the desired of the nations was to be descended from Abraham by way of Isaac rather than through Ismael,[16] and from Isaac through Jacob or Israel rather than through Esau.[17] It was announced, furthermore, that Juda was the son of Jacob who would have the honor of numbering the future king among his progeny,[18] and that this eternal ruler would arise from the family of David within the tribe of Juda.[19]

[13] *John*, 17:24.
[14] Cf. *Gen.* 3:15.
[15] Cf. *Gen.* 12:1 ff.; 18:17 f.; 22:16 ff.
[16] Cf. *Gen.* 21:12.
[17] Cf. *Gen.* 27:27 ff.
[18] Cf. *Gen.* 49:8-12.
[19] Cf. *Os.* 3:5; *Jer.* 30:9; *Ez.* 34:23.

The kingdom of God on earth, the association of those men and women who accepted divine supernatural revelation and who thus subjected themselves to the special and supernatural law of God, taking Him as their ruler or king in a way quite distinct from and superior to the manner in which He rules over the universe as king by the very force of His creative activity, received its first codification of divine legislation when God gave the law and the covenant to the children of Israel during their wanderings from Egypt into the promised land.[20] By reason of this covenant the racial and religious association of the family of Israel became in a special sense the people of God, the recipient of His favors.

In one sense, God's covenant with Israel was destined to endure forever. The people or the kingdom of God on earth was always destined to be the true Israel, the progeny of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. As time went on, however, God revealed to the members of this company that the form of the kingdom was going to develop, and that the Israel of the new and definitive covenant on this earth was not to be merely the nation composed of the blood descendants of the great patriarchs. The kingdom of the new law or the new dispensation was to be universal in scope.

The *ecclesia* of the new dispensation, the company of the disciples organized and ruled by Our Lord, is essentially this new and everlasting Israel and the possessor of God's promises to His kingdom. When the old Israel rejected its divine Saviour, it automatically destroyed the faith in function of which it possessed the prerogatives of God's kingdom on earth. It was no longer the *congregatio fidelium*. The society of the disciples, which Our Lord had fashioned within the fabric of the older Israel, kept that faith. It stood as the faithful remnant of Israel and as the continuation of the kingdom. It was, moreover, by virtue of God's own ordering, established as His kingdom on a plane and with a degree of excellence which the older society had never enjoyed. The intimacy of association with Himself which God has condescended to give to His children is far greater under the new covenant than it ever was or could be under the old. Furthermore, under the old law, it was perfectly possible for a man to live and die in the friendship of God without having anything to do with the politico-religious unity of Israel. Under the new law, however, no man can be saved unless

[20] Cf. *Lev.* 26:1-45.

he belongs to the Church, as a member or as one who sincerely desires to become a member.

Characteristically the New Testament describes the Church in function of God's promises to His people. Thus, explaining his belief before the court of the king Agrippa II, the Apostle of the Gentiles stated that he was imprisoned "for the hope of the promise that was made by God to the fathers."[21] In his letter to the Romans he spoke of "the gospel of God" as something which God "had promised before, by His prophets, in the holy scriptures."[22] St. Paul insisted strongly upon the fact that the blessings which God has promised to the progeny of Abraham are intended neither ultimately nor exclusively for the old and carnal Israel, the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh, but also and especially for the new and spiritual seed of Abraham, the society which professes and which lives by that faith through which the patriarch himself drew near to God. "Therefore it is of faith," he writes, "that according to grace the promise might be firm to all the seed: not only to that which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."[23]

St. Paul stressed the superiority of the Church of the new dispensation over the Israelitic commonwealth, the kingdom under the old law. He drove this lesson home to his Galatians by the use of an analogy. The society which had enjoyed the status as God's kingdom on earth during the time of the older covenant is likened to Ismael, Abraham's son by a bondmaiden, and rejected as the recipient of the divine promises given to Abraham. The society of the disciples, on the other hand, is compared to Isaac, whose mother was a free woman and the true wife of Abraham. The servility and inferiority of the old society in contrast to the new is further illustrated by a comparison of Mt. Sinai, the birthplace of the old dispensation with Jerusalem, where the blood of the new covenant was shed. Furthermore, in terms of this same analogy, the hostility of the synagogue towards the Church is also explained.

Tell me, you that desire to be under the law, have you not read the law?

For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman and the other by a free woman.

---

[21] *Acts*, 26:6; cf. *Acts* 13:32.

[22] *Rom.* 1:2.

[23] *Rom.* 4:16.

But he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh: but he of the free woman was by promise.

Which things are said by an allegory. For these are the two testaments. The one from Mount Sina, engendering unto bondage which is Agar.

For Sina is a mountain in Arabia, which hath affinity to that Jerusalem which now is: and is in bondage with her children.

But that Jerusalem which is above is free: which is our mother . . .

Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

But as then he that was born according to the flesh persecuted him that was after the spirit: so also it is now.[24]

The fact that Our Lord followed the Old Testament law of circumcision was, according to St. Paul, "to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."[25] And, furthermore, in preaching to the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia, St. Paul explained the Incarnation itself as the divine fulfillment of a promise made to David the King. "Of this man's seed," he said, "God, according to his promise, hath raised up to Israel a Saviour Jesus."[26]

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul speaks of God's covenant with His kingdom and His announcements that those who belong to that kingdom are His children as "promises" given to and possessed by the society of the disciples.[27] He therefore considers the indwelling Holy Ghost as a gift promised and delivered to those who attached themselves to Our Lord through entrance into His Church. He speaks of Christ, "In whom you also, after you had heard the word of truth (the gospel of your salvation), in whom also believing, you were signed with the Holy Spirit of promise."[28] Actually these Gentile Christians were not members of the kingdom of God before their calling into the Church. St. Paul reminds them that they were "at that time without Christ, being aliens from the conversation of Israel and strangers to the testament, having no hope of the promise and without God in this world."[29] Henceforward, however, as the result of the salvific work of Christ, these Christians are "no more strangers and foreigners," with reference to the true kingdom of God, but "fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God."[30] In other words, it is the characteristic teaching of Christian

[24] *Gal.* 4:21-26, 28 f.
[25] *Rom.* 15:8.
[26] *Acts,* 13:23.
[27] *II Cor.* 7:1.
[28] *Eph.* 1:13.
[29] *Eph.* 2:12.
[30] *Eph.* 2:19.

revelation "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs and of the same body: and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel."[31]

The benefits which God has promised to His Church, and which are not to be attained apart from this Church, will be received by those who work to gain them according to the precepts of the supernatural life. The Epistle to the Hebrews warns its readers that they should "become not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience shall inherit the promises."[32] Patience (ὑπομονή), the endurance of that suffering which Christians must endure by reason of their effective resistance against the world, the flesh, and the devil, is further depicted as necessary "that, doing the will of God, you may receive the promise."[33]

The Second Epistle of St. Peter brings out the ultimate and decisive good which is the object of the divine promises. It tells the Christian reader that Our Lord is the one by whom God "hath given us most great and precious promises: that by these you may be made partakers of the divine nature: flying the corruption of that concupiscence which is in the world."[34] Furthermore this same letter tells the Christians that "we look for new heavens and a new earth according to his promises, in which justice dwelleth."[35] Thus all of the promises which God has given to the world in His Son combine to bring about the life of grace in the faithful. In that life of grace, the glory of God is achieved through our elevation to that dignity in which we become partakers of the divine nature, able to understand the Triune God by an intuitive act of the mind, and thereby to love and praise Him in a manner ineffably distinct from and superior to the merely natural way of knowing and glorifying Him. Since, by reason of the fall, the "world," as the human family not incorporated into Christ and in some way obedient to the impulses of Satan, "the prince of this world," is opposed to the glory of God in Christ, the man who receives the good promised by God must avoid the corruption of the concupiscence in the world.

This same lesson is brought out in the Catholic Epistle of St. James. "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for, when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life which God hath promised to them that love him."[36] This crown of life is prom-

[31] *Eph.* 3:6.
[32] *Heb.* 6:12.
[33] *Heb.* 10:36.
[34] *II Pet.* 1:4.
[35] *II Pet.* 3:13.
[36] *James,* 1:12.

ised, not to the rich and powerful, but as it were, primarily, to the poor and weak of this world. "Hearken, my dearest brethren: Hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him?"[37] The kingdom of God, the *ecclesia,* is depicted here again as something promised by God to men. It is promised, first of all, as an institution existent upon this earth, as a society within which men may find and enjoy the fellowship of Christ. Ultimately, of course, it is promised in its final perfection in the next world.

In the Pastoral Epistles St. Paul insists upon the fact that the Christians have received promises of life. Writing to St. Timothy the Apostle of the Gentiles describes himself as "an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus."[38] In his letter to Titus he likewise incorporates the notion of the promise into his teaching on the apostolic vocation.

> Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of the elect of God and the acknowledging of the truth, which is according to godliness:
>
> Unto the hope of life everlasting, which God, who lieth not, hath promised before the times of the world:
>
> But hath in due times manifested his word in preaching, which is committed to me according to the commandment of God our Saviour.[39]

In other words, the entire mechanism of the Church is presented in the letters of St. Paul and in the other documents of the New Testament as something which God has promised to His children. A man becomes a partaker of these promises when he answers the divine call and enters into the company of Jesus Christ within the Church. This is the very lesson which St. Peter taught in his sermon on the first Christian Pentecost.

> Now when they had heard these things [the words of St. Peter], they had compunction in their heart and said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles: What shall we do, men and brethren?
>
> But Peter said to them: Do penance: and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins. And you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.
>
> For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are far off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call.

---

[37] *James,* 2:5. [38] *II Tim.* 1:1. [39] *Tit.* 1:1 ff.

And with very many other words did he testify and exhort them, saying: Save yourselves from this perverse generation.

They therefore that received his word were baptized: and there were added in that day about three thousand souls.[40]

St. Peter spoke of "the gift of the Holy Ghost" as the thing promised by God to those who accepted the divine message. This gift, of course, the apostles and all the other disciples of Our Lord had just received on this first Christian Pentecost. It was and is the indwelling of the blessed Trinity within the true Church, in such a way that this Church is rendered competent to prolong the mission of Christ within the world by bringing His salvation to men and by exercising within itself the life of divine grace. Thus, in effect, the words of St. Peter mean that those who enter and live within the Church will be in the company of God as the members of His chosen people.

According to St. Peter, the person who obeyed the divine command and entered into the Church of Jesus Christ became dissociated from the "perverse generation" which is the company of those outside the kingdom of God on earth, and in a certain way under the direction or the influence of Satan, "the prince of this world." It is interesting to note that he sees no alternative. The two societies face each other on this earth, in such a way that every man belongs to one of them or to the other. There is no escape from the "perverse generation" other than by the process of entering into the society of the disciples. Obviously not all of those who are within the Church are by that very fact in the state of grace. Neither, on the other hand, are all of those outside the membership of the Church necessarily in the state of aversion from God. Nevertheless, the bad Catholic lives as an unworthy member of Christ, while the non-member of the Church who is in the state of grace possesses this divine and supernatural life by reason of the fact that, in desire or intention, he is connected with God's true kingdom on earth. Thus he lives a life that belongs to the society towards which he tends.

Furthermore, in speaking of the "gift of the Holy Ghost," St. Peter was obviously referring to that ultimate and determining factor among the divine promises made to and through the Church which is mentioned in the Introduction to the Gospel according to

[40] *Acts*, 2:37-41.

St. John. There it is said of Christ that "as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God, to them that believe in his name."[41] The faithful Christians, the believers in and the disciples of Our Lord, are called the sons of God in that they are brought to the kind of life which naturally belongs to God Himself, and which is wholly above the natural competence of any creature, actual or possible. In terms of that life, which finds its corporate expression in the activity of the Church, the disciples are called the children of God.

The ultimate act of this divine and supernatural life is that of the beatific vision, the clear understanding, and hence the possession of God in Himself. Every intellectual creature is naturally competent to know the existence of God as the First Cause of the created universe, and to understand the truths implicit in the concept of the First Cause. In the beatific vision, however, the blessed are strengthened and raised up by God so as to be able to understand Him directly, as He is in Himself, without needing recourse to the notion of the First Cause, to know Him intuitively.

The beatific vision is the ultimate and the determining act in the supernatural life. The supernatural life itself, however, consists of the entire complexus or fabric of activity connected with the beatific vision, as well as the beatific vision itself. The basic quality by which the creature is strengthened and rendered connaturally able to live the supernatural life is sanctifying grace. God is said to dwell in the soul which possesses the life of sanctifying grace in so far as that soul is able to know Him and love Him in a way essentially distinct from and superior to the mode of knowledge and affection of which intellectual creatures are naturally capable. The indwelling of the Blessed Trinity according to the life of sanctifying grace is appropriated to God the Holy Ghost. This is the "gift of the Holy Ghost" of which St. Peter spoke. It is the condition of the children of God in Jesus Christ, the condition of those who, by their fellowship with the divine Son of God Himself, are rendered like to God in that they may understand Him and love Him in His way, as He is in Himself, rather than in the manner characteristic of creatures in their natural state.

Now the Church of God in this world, the Church militant which is immediately the beneficiary of the divine promises, does not

[41] *John*, 1:12.

yet enjoy the glory and the happiness of the beatific vision. In the words of St. Paul to his Corinthians, "we walk by faith, and not by sight."[42] For the Church militant, the truths which are understood in the next world in the clarity of the beatific vision are perceived in this world by divine faith, in such a way that the faith itself serves as a preparation for the glory of the Church triumphant in heaven. As the formula of Baptism reminds us, the Church on earth is in some way the divinely ordained dispenser of the faith. The candidate for Baptism, the rite of initiation into the Church of Christ, is met by the minister, who asks him what he seeks of the Church of God. The answer is: "Faith." To the next question, in which the minister asks the candidate what this faith will bring him to, the reply is: "Life everlasting."

Thus, according to the formula and the practice of the Church itself, the divine faith which is the prinicple of the supernatural life in its preparatory status in this world comes to men through their adherence to the society of the disciples. The faith, together with the divine and supernatural life of sanctifying grace, to which it leads, constitute the effect of that "gift of the Holy Ghost" which St. Peter described as offered and promised by Our Lord to those who dwell in the true kingdom of God in this world.

This then is an integral part of the basic concept of the true Church, the notion of the Church as the recipient of Our Lord's own promises, and as the institution which He and His apostles described as the company within which the promises made to the chosen people of the old dispensation were accomplished. One of the central mysteries of God's merciful dealings with the children of men is to be found in the fact that this assembly, the true Church of the promises, is actually a visible, tangible, society, the visible congregation which the world knows as the Catholic Church.

The ordinary "definitions" of the Church, found in the theological textbooks and even in the catechetical manuals of the Catholic world, are meant to identify, rather than merely to describe this institution. The movements hostile to the kingdom of God on earth during the course of fairly recent history have not attempted to deny the existence of a Church of the promises. They have rather attempted to deceive people into imagining that this kingdom of the promises is some amorphous social entity, something which

[42] *II Cor.* 5:7.

includes all men in the state of grace or in some sort of "good will," something at any rate quite distinct from the visible Catholic Church.

Definitions of the Church in terms of its membership, formulae like that drawn up by St. Robert Bellarmine, are, in the last analysis, intended to show that the Church of the promises is actually the society over which the Roman Pontiff presides as visible head and as the vicar of Jesus Christ Our Lord. Hence it is downright silly to suppose, as Michalon does in the recent symposium *Église et unité*, that this type of definition can be, for some people at least, a little deceptive.[43] It is difficult to see how anyone could possibly be deceived or misled through the process of learning that the Church of the promises, the glorious *ecclesia* of the new dispensation, the kingdom of God on earth, is actually a living and visible society open and available to all.

Actually the definitions of the Church found in most catechisms and in most manuals of dogmatic theology have always been aimed towards bringing out into the sharpest possible focus the paramount truth that the visible Catholic Church is the kingdom of God's promises or the mystical body of Jesus Christ. In his great encyclical, the *Humani generis*, the Holy Father lists the contradiction of this truth as one of the poisonous fruits resulting from basic contemporary errors in the field of sacred theology. With this indication in mind, it is manifestly the business of Catholic theologians today, not to seek to discredit the traditional definitions of the Church, but to employ all of their resources in the work of explaining the tremendously rich content and background of these formulae. Such genuine theological work is in line with the Holy Father's directives. It is a work by which our theologians can contribute to the accomplishment of God's promises in His children.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[43] Cf. the essay "L'étendue de l'église." in *Église et unité* (Lille, 1948), p. 95.

Answers to Questions

WHEN THE COMMON PREFACE IS A PROPER ONE

Question: In our diocese the anniversary of the consecration of the Cathedral is celebrated on June 30. The Mass is of course that of the consecration, *Terribilis,* with commemorative orations, in Low Masses, of St. Paul and St. Peter. Our local Ordo prescribes the *Praefatio communis.* Should we not say the *Praefatio de apostolis* since when there is a commemoration of a feast which has a proper Preface in a Mass which has no proper Preface, the Preface of the commemorated feast is to be said?

Answer: It is indeed true that when a Mass has no proper Preface and the feast commemorated has one the latter is to be said as the Preface of the day. *In casu,* however, this conflict is not verified. "Believe it or not," the *Praefatio communis* is the *Praefatio propria* for Masses at the consecration of a church or the anniversary of the same. This will be evident from the rubrics introducing the text of the Common Preface in the Missal. There it is directed, under 2, that the *Praefatio communis* is to be said in all Masses of the consecration of a church or of any other mystery of Our Lord. We note that the feast concerning the consecration of a church ranks as a *festum Domini.*

THE SEQUENCE OF BIRETTA AND GENUFLECTION

Question: Every priest removes his biretta and gives it to the deacon, or server, before genuflecting on arrival at the altar. We do not find such uniformity in the practice on leaving the altar. Many take the biretta before they genuflect to return to the sacristy. Others make the genuflection first and then take the biretta. Which procedure is the correct one?

Answer: We may set it down as a rule that the first thing the priest does on reaching the foot of the altar is to remove his biretta, which he hands to his attendant, and then he makes the genuflection or bow. The last thing which a celebrant does before returning from the altar to the sacristy is to put on the biretta, which is only

passed to him *after* he has made the genuflection, or the inclination, when the latter is prescribed. This sequence is to be observed whether the priest is carrying the chalice or not. This is the order prescribed by the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* (XII, 6), in the front of the Missal. All ceremonial authorities set down the same sequence for Solemn Mass when the celebrant is not carrying the chalice (cf. Fortescue, p. 137; Martinucci, I, xiv, 138; *Baltimore Ceremonial,* III, Chap. II, Art. vii, 21; Baldeschi, III, vii, 22; *et alii*).

THE MULTIPLICATION OF OCTAVES

Question: Should not a petition be sent to the Congregation of Rites so that something can be done about simultaneous octaves? We have just celebrated the overlapping octaves of St. John the Baptist and SS. Peter and Paul, further complicated in some dioceses by the octave of the dedication of the Cathedral. When Easter comes very late we can have the complexity of a fourth simultaneous octave, that of the Feast of the Sacred Heart.

Answer: We doubt the effectiveness of a petition for the suppression of simultaneous octaves, which cause awkward complications in the arrangement of the office and occasion a long sequence of orations at Mass. We promise our questioner that, immediately after being crowned with the tiara, we shall issue a *Motu proprio,* suppressing all octaves, except the very ancient ones at Easter and Pentecost.

THE ASSISTANT PRIEST AT SOLEMN MASS

Question: All are agreed that a young priest may have an assistant priest as well as a deacon and subdeacon at his first Solemn Mass. Many extend this privilege to the Jubilee Mass of a priest ordained twenty-five years. When there is an assistant priest, there is usually much confusion as to what he should do and where he should stand. Questions arise as to when he should be incensed, to whom he should give the *Pax,* etc. Is there any set of explicit directions telling the assistant priest what he should do?

Answer: An assistant priest may attend a newly-ordained priest at his first Solemn Mass but there is no authority for having one at a Silver Jubilee Mass. There are some differences of opinion

concerning certain *minutiae* of the service of an assistant priest but most ceremonials (e.g. Wapelhorst, p. 151; Fortescue, p. 153), describe his duties in detail.

PATRIARCHS AND PROPHETS IN THE LITURGY

Question: The Litany of the Saints contains a petition for the intercession of all the holy Patriarchs and Prophets yet none of these Old Testament saints figure in the liturgy. Is any recognition given to them in Masses or Offices for special places?

Answer: The Prophet Isaias is commemorated in every Mass in the *Munda cor meum* before the Gospel. The Canon of the Mass every day has a reference to Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech in the second prayer after the consecration. The writings of the Prophets are frequently read as lessons at Mass and in the Scripture occurring of the Office. Quite often verses from the Prophets replace the more usual selection from the Psalms for the Introit of the Mass. The position of St. John the Baptist as a super-Prophet gives him precedence among all the saints after the Blessed Virgin herself but this singular distinction ranks him outside of and above the general classification contained in the Litany petition for the intercession of Patriarchs and Prophets. Hence, in the liturgy, St. John the Baptist figures with eminence.

The Martyrology assigns feasts to the following Saints of the Old Law: Jeremias (May 1), Aaron (July 1), Isaias (July 6), Elias (July 20), Daniel (July 21), Moses (Sept. 4), Abraham (Oct. 9), and David (Dec. 29).

Offices and Masses for these Patriarchs and Prophets are restricted to the calendar of saints *pro aliquibus locis*. For example, the Carmelites celebrate the feast of St. Elias, and with solemnity, on July 20. This holy man appears in the Martyrology under that date with the following notice: *In Monte Carmelo, Sancti Eliae Prophetae.*

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

DISPENSATION FROM THE BANNS OF MARRIAGE

Question: Is the fact that a young woman, planning marriage, has recently lost a parent by death sufficient reason to justify a dispensation from the publication of the banns of marriage?

Answer: This would seem to be a sufficient reason. A girl in such a situation naturally wishes a very quiet wedding, and it might be difficult to obtain this if the banns were published in the regular way. However, when a dispensation from the banns is granted, the priest in charge of the prenuptial investigation should be most careful to see to it that there is no impediment to the marriage.

NON-CATHOLIC STUDENTS IN A CATHOLIC COLLEGE

Question 1: May the authorities of a Catholic college make a ruling that non-Catholic students shall regularly attend services in their respective churches in the town?

Question 2: May the college authorities provide transportation for non-Catholic students who wish to attend services in their own churches?

Question 3: May these authorities require non-Catholic students to attend Catholic religious instructions and religious services?

Answer 1: It is difficult to see how the authorities of a Catholic college could in conscience *command* the non-Catholic students to participate in religious functions in their respective churches. For Catholics logically believe that active participation in a public non-Catholic religious service is objectively an intrinsically evil act; and to command such attendance would be formal co-operation. The only instance in which it might be justified would be the case of a non-Catholic who would otherwise entirely neglect the practice of religion. It might be permitted to induce or command such a person to attend services in accordance with his belief on the principle that we may urge another to commit the lesser of two sins when it is the only means of preventing him from committing the greater. But such a case would rarely, if ever, arise in respect to the non-Catholic students at a Catholic college. It is to be noted that we are concerned with the problem of *commanding* attendance, not merely *allowing* it. Ordinarily the authorities of a Catholic college may and even should allow the non-Catholic students to attend their respective churches.

Answer 2: To provide transportation for non-Catholic students wishing to attend services at their own churches would be material co-operation, sufficiently remote to be justified by a moderately grave reason. Such a reason, it seems, would be present ordinarily in a Catholic college when some of the non-Catholic students sincerely wish to attend their own religious services and ask for transportation.

Answer 3: It would be lawful, *per se,* for the authorities of a Catholic college to require that even the non-Catholic students attend Catholic religious instructions and services. For, surely, a private institution under Catholic auspices has the right to pass such a regulation. Non-Catholic schools sometimes demand the presence of all the students, whatever may be their creed, at the chapel services. However, in Catholic colleges, while it would be reasonable to require the presence of all the students at religious instructions, the prudence of such a ruling with reference to attendance at religious services could be questioned. Some of the non-Catholic students might have qualms of conscience regarding such attendance. It might be answered that in this supposition they should withdraw from the Catholic college; but the more prudent procedure would seem to be to make attendance at Catholic services a matter of free choice rather than of obligation for non-Catholic students.

CATHOLICS AT EASTER SUNRISE SERVICE

Question 1: Would Catholics be permitted to attend an "Easter sunrise service"—conducted, of course, by a Protestant minister?

Question 2: Would a Catholic be allowed to sing in the choir at such a service?

Answer 1: An Easter sunrise service conducted by a Protestant minister is undoubtedly a public non-Catholic service; hence, *per se* a Catholic is forbidden to attend it. Active participation would be intrinsically wrong, and accordingly could never be allowed under any circumstances. Passive participation (mere presence) would be permitted for a grave reason, provided there were no danger of scandal or of perversion (Canon 1258). It is safe to say that a Catholic would seldom have a sufficient reason for attending such

a service. Certainly, the mere desire to see the ceremonies, however elaborate and picturesque they may be, is not a justifying reason. However, to attend one such service merely out of curiosity would be only a venial sin, as long as there is no danger of scandal or of perversion.

Answer 2: Since it is active participation to sing in the choir for a religious service, a Catholic would never be allowed to participate in the Easter sunrise service in this way. Unquestionably such a manner of participation would be a mortal sin.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

OUR LORD'S KINGSHIP AND HIS PRIESTHOOD

When we say, then, that the Kingship of Christ is ordained to His Priesthood, we are referring to the actual exercise of government by which Christ directs His followers to their end—union with God. This union can only be realized in and by His Priesthood, because Christ is the official Mediator of Supernatural Life between God and man. It is in view of communicating the Divine Life of union and consummating His Priesthood that Christ rules the faithful.

So it is, too, with the rulers of the Church to whom Christ confided the task of perpetuating His spiritual Kingship on earth. These rulers teach the faithful exclusively in order that they may show them the way to God; they draft laws and sanction precepts only that they may facilitate the progress of their subjects towards the Life of the Beatific Vision. But the road to heaven is found and progress is achieved only through means of sanctification placed at the disposal of the faithful by the whole order of worship and the sacraments. The sole aim of the Church's government is to assure the faithful a participation in the Priesthood of Christ in the worship established by Him.

—Fr. Héris, in *The Mystery of Christ* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1950), p. 181.

Book Reviews

THE HISTORY OF THE CHAPLAIN CORPS, U. S. NAVY. Vol. I. By Clifford Merrill Drury, USNR. Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel. Pp. 274. $2.25.

Although the first Christian apostles and countless missionaries were familiar with the perils of the sea, in the history of our country, until recent years, Catholic priests have played no great part in serving men of the United States Navy. This is all the more surprising since a large part of Navy personnel has been and is unchurched and presents a fertile field for missionary labors. Although there was probably one Jesuit aboard a warship previously, in some capacity or other, the first clear evidence of a priest becoming a Navy chaplain is in the commission of the Reverend Charles H. Parks, of New York, whose commission is dated April 30, 1888 and who resigned on January 25, 1900.

Chaplain Drury writes, "The mariner of yesterday who dared sail his craft out beyond the unchartered wilderness of the sea had good reason to be afraid. Beyond the horizon was the great mystery of the unknown." Whatever appeal the forces of nature may have made, early chaplains had no easy task in winning their sailor flock to the service of God. Horace wrote, "Qui nescit orare, discat navigare," but Horace was not prescribed reading in the Navy.

One cannot read Chaplain Drury's first volume, in which he displays both earnestness of purpose and great skill as a narrator, without admiration for those ministers of many faiths who seemed to have as their bond of unity the desire to serve men and to bring them to the knowledge of the Gospel. At times their office was made unbearable by the arrogance and despotism of men who commanded some of our vessels. It was not until the Naval Academy, which incidentally owes its origin largely to a chaplain, came into existence that the words "naval officer" and "gentleman" became more or less synonymous. And yet the term "chaplain" goes back to the legend of St. Martin of Tours. It received glorious significance in our history by the three score men who died while bringing consolations of religion to our forces in World War I and World War II.

Although only four Catholic priests became Navy chaplains in the nineteenth century and only twelve more until 1917, some of these priests became Navy legends. The late Monsignor Chidwick, of the USS *Maine*, a man who loved the Navy intensely, had just finished reading his office on February 15, 1898 when the *Maine* was sunk. He,

one of the 89 survivors, did his work so well that the Secretary of the Navy wrote him: "Your heroic devotion to duty, your tender sympathy with the afflicted; your care for the dead; your fearless fidelity to your post, mark you as a true servant of the Master. You have set an example for the emulation of every chaplain in the Navy, and are entitled to the gratitude of the Department and of every American citizen."

Father William Henry Ironsides Reaney was born on the frigate *Constitution* and as a youth found himself torn between two loves, for the Church and for the sea. These loyalties were wedded in his service as a Catholic chaplain from 1892 until November, 1915 when he died in New York. "Old Ironsides," as he was affectionately called, probably had the distinction of being the only Catholic priest ever to lay hands on a President of the United States. As the sparring partner of President Theodore Roosevelt, he both gave and received.

Another great Navy tradition was the beloved Father Matthew C. Gleeson who served from 1903 to 1927. Although the reviewer did not begin his naval service until fourteen years later, he heard enough stories about Father Gleeson to warrant a whole volume on this great priest. His impression on young officers was so profound that Fleet Admiral William Halsey, who served with him, took him as the topic of an address twenty years after his death. President Theodore Roosevelt also cited Father Gleeson for bravery in the turret explosion on the *Missouri* in 1904 in these words: "Father Gleeson's behaviour throughout this trying ordeal was in every way such as to give legitimate reason for satisfaction and pride to all interested in the Navy, and to all, therefore, who believe that the Chaplains of the Navy should show courage, common sense, and efficiency no less than devotion to the spiritual and material well being of those aboard the ships."

Msgr. John J. Brady, who died a Rear Admiral on the list of retired Navy chaplains, served with great distinction from 1914 until 1934 and assisted in work of the Military Ordinariate during World War II. He too, was a great naval legend who left his mark upon countless officers and men primarily by his fine priestly qualities. Fortunately he was in a position to render great service on the battlefields of France in 1918 where he, along with Father Harris Darche, won medals for bravery. Monsignor Brady had the unique distinction of wearing the Army's Distinguished Service Cross, as well as the Croix de Guerre and the Navy Cross with silver star. Of him, the official record reads: "He exposed himself fearlessly making a complete tour of the front lines twice."

While his most distinguished work was in World War II, Chaplain William A. Maguire receives great praise in Captain Drury's work.

Father Maguire wears the Navy Cross for his heroism after World War I. He led a rescue party to a boat which exploded. His two works on the naval chaplaincy have attracted to the service several present Catholic chaplains.

Those who came into the Navy as chaplains in World War II were the beneficiaries of those priests who gave most of their lives to the Navy. Chaplain Drury reveals that the average length of service of a priest in the Navy is brief. The result is that, at least until recently, Catholics in the Navy have been neglected. The reorganization of the Military Ordinariate prior to World War II and the prestige accorded priests in the service augur well for the future. At the present moment Cardinal Spellman is appealing for more chaplains. This appeal must be heard by zealous young priests who have a capacity for physical hardships, for working with those not of their faith, and for keeping priestly ideals intact in an environment that is often spiritually perilous. The confidence priests have in their Chief of Chaplains, Rear Admiral S. W. Salisbury, will give them a sense of security in the days which lie ahead.

The second volume of Captain Drury's history will appear shortly. It should be required reading for those who are quick to criticize but slow to appreciate the contribution priests may make while in the armed services.

MONSIGNOR MAURICE S. SHEEHY

WHERE I FOUND CHRIST. The Intimate Personal Stories of Fourteen Coverts to the Catholic Faith. Edited by John A. O'Brien. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1950. Pp. 271. $2.50.

It is safe to say that no contemporary priest has done more towards the progress of the convert movement in the United States than Fr. John A. O'Brien. Since his masterly symposium, *The White Harvest*, appeared over twenty years ago, Dr. O'Brien has taken the lead in the work of encouraging those outside the Church to understand and to enter this society. In contributing to and editing *Where I Found Christ*, the distinguished Notre Dame professor has once more placed American Catholicism in his debt.

The present volume is a kind of sequel to or a continuation of a previous symposium edited by Dr. O'Brien, *The Road to Damascus*. As in *The Road to Damascus* and in Lambing's *Through Hundred Gates*, we find in *Where I Found Christ* a series of essays by notable converts describing their own pathways into the true Church. Notable among the stories in *Where I Found Christ* are those of Bishop Hunt, of Fr. Merton, of the Rev. Mr. Dulles, and of Daniel Sargent.

Dr. O'Brien has contributed an introduction, "The Quest for God," and an epilogue, "The Open Door," to the symposium he has so ably edited. In this last essay, however, we find a passage which detracts from the value of the entire work. Dr. O'Brien writes that:

> It is well here to come to grips with a common misconception of Catholic teaching: that the Church holds that only those who are visible members of her faith can be saved. The idea stems from an utterance of St. Cyprian, one of the Fathers of the early Church, who said: "Outside the Church there is no salvation!" The saying has often been repeated in Catholic books, but it needs to be interpreted properly.
>
> There is membership in the *body* of the Church: this embraces all those in visible communion, who attend her services, and acknowledge her authority. There is also a membership in the *soul* of the Church: this includes all who follow the light of their conscience, who worship God according to the dictates of their reason. Obviously a just and merciful God cannot punish such individuals; in their blamelessness and good faith, they share as members of the soul of the Church in the graces and fruits of the Redemption in working out their salvation (pp. 259 f.).

Obviously it is a "misconception of Catholic teaching" to think that the Church teaches that only those who are actually its own members can obtain the beatific vision. Parenthetically, however, we should observe that, by reason of the tone or the direction of much of our contemporary Catholic writing, there is little likelihood that this is a common misconception in our own time and in our own country. A far more common and serious fault among us manifests itself in a tendency to void the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation of all effective and practical meaning. Unfortunately Dr. O'Brien's *excursus* contributes to this very tendency.

It is at least misleading to dismiss the axiom "Outside the Church there is no salvation," merely as "an utterance of St. Cyprian." When the Martyr-Bishop of Carthage wrote to Pomponius that *"nemini salus esse nisi in ecclesia possit,"* (the closest approximation, incidentally, to the form "outside the Church there is no salvation" to be found in his extant works), he was not expressing any singular opinion, but a dogma of the Catholic Churh. Furthermore, Dr. O'Brien's assertion that "this saying has often been repeated in Catholic books" may well be considered as one of the outstanding understatements of our time. Among the books in which this doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation has been repeated we may list the *decreta* of oecumenical councils, the *acta* of various Roman Pontiffs, and every serious theological treatise *de ecclesia* written during the past four centuries.

It is true, of course, that the dogma of the Church's necessity must be explained, but any interpretation based upon the concept of membership

in the soul of the Church is something less than satisfactory. In the final analysis, such an explanation tends to explain away the doctrine, rather than to explain it.

It is unfortunate that this teaching has been inserted into a volume as valuable and as well-written as *Where I Found Christ*. It is definitely beneath the level of excellence which our readers have come to expect from Dr. O'Brien. The book would be improved if this section were removed from the future editions this work so richly deserves.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

WHITHER GOEST THOU? Retreat Conferences for Religious. By the Most Rev. E. K. Lynch, Ph.D., D.D., O.Carm. Westminster: Newman Press, 1949.

This series of thirty-three conferences on religious perfection by the Prior General of the Carmelite order contains sufficient matter for an eight day retreat. The Ignatian system is not followed; the conferences are not distributed over four weeks, each destined to produce a definite psychological effect. The book, however, is not devoid of plan. The author's object is to explain and inculcate the truths and practices conducive to religious and sacerdotal perfection. Hence he begins with the truths fundamental to all Christian perfection: the purpose of life, the love of God, the purity of intention, the oneness with Christ, the heinousness of sin, death and judgment. Having expounded these, he proceeds to the religious vocation with its vows, rules, its public and private prayer, its problems of humility, self-denial, charity, and zeal. There are, also special meditations for priests: the Mass, the priesthood, and the Divine Office. The retreat closes with two conferences on our Lady and a meditation on perseverance.

The matter embodied in each conference will not appear novel to the well-trained religious. But it is theologically sound, comprehensive, and practical; it is proposed in clear, intelligible, and impressive language, without turgid oratory. The book, then, may be recommended most heartily to retreat masters, to exercitants, and to all interested in religious perfection.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

MISSION INTENTION

The Holy Father's Mission Intention for the month of October, 1950, is the Care of the Sick in Mission Areas.